

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 31, 1995

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOODLING].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 31, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable WILLIAM F. GOODLING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEW T. GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority and minority leader, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for 5 minutes.

VOTE AGAINST H.R. 1833, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1833 which would ban second- and third-term abortions in the case of severe threats to the life and health of the mother and cases of severe fetal anomaly.

Proponents of the bill attempt to exploit one of the greatest tragedies any family faces by using graphic pictures, sensationalized language, and distorted truths. Families facing a late-term abortion are families that want to have a child. These couples have chosen to become parents and only face the decision of abortion due to unavoidable circumstances.

Unfortunately, medical testing is still not sophisticated enough to detect fetal anomalies until late in the pregnancies. Also, some illnesses such as diabetes or kidney failure can suddenly flare up and put the health and life of the mother at risk. The decision to abort at this stage in a pregnancy is agonizing and deeply personal.

This bill is not about choice. It is about necessity. As the mother of three

grown children, I thank God every day that my children were born healthy and strong. However, not everyone is so lucky.

Yesterday my office received a call from Claudia Ades, a woman who lives in Santa Monica, CA. She had heard about the bill and called to ask me if there was anything we could do to defeat it. As Claudia said so passionately, "this procedure saved my life and the life of my family."

Three years ago, Claudia was pregnant and happier than she had ever been in her life. However, 6 months into her pregnancy she and her husband discovered that the child she was carrying suffered from a number of severe fetal anomalies, including acute brain damage, a very malformed heart. It was doubtful that the child would survive birth; and, if it survived, its short life would be filled with pain and suffering.

After speaking to a number of doctors, Claudia and her husband finally had to accept their view that there was no way to save this pregnancy. They chose to go to Dr. James McMannus because his procedure would allow Claudia to get pregnant in the future and would allow them to have a family. "This was a desperately wanted pregnancy," Claudia said yesterday, "but my child was just not meant to be in this world."

Who here cannot sympathize with the pain that Claudia and her family faced? Those of us with healthy children can only imagine the horror that Claudia felt when she received the news about her child's condition. It is the news that all mothers pray every day they will never have to hear.

But in those tragic cases where families do hear this horrible news, who should get to decide? If, God forbid, this ever happened to me or somebody in my family, I would want the decision to be mine just as any of you would.

The one thing that I know for sure is that the decision should not be made by the Congress of the United States. At that horrible, tragic moment the Congress, the Government, just has no place in the home, in the hearts, in the decisionmaking of these agonizing families.

I beg my colleagues to think very carefully, to vote against H.R. 1833. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. This is not a pro-choice or an anti-choice issue. This tragedy can strike any family regardless of party affiliation.

Defeat this bill so that women in Claudia's situation can get the best medical care possible. Defeat this bill because it is the right thing to do.

WORKERS' RIGHTS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in his desperate effort to hold on to power at any cost and by any means necessary, Cuban tyrant Fidel Castro has turned the Cuban economy into a slavlike system.

In Castro's new economy, where foreign investors call the shots, workers get the short end of the deal.

While the regime collects all the hard currency produced by foreign investors, the Cuban worker, already denied his civil and human rights, is paid by the State.

Not in hard currency, but in Cuban pesos, at the official rate of one peso per dollar, although, in reality, the real exchange rate is more like 25 pesos to the dollar.

As one foreign investor put it, "you pay \$500 for an employee, and he receives the equivalent of \$20."

In Cuba, Mr. Speaker, independent labor unions, worker strikes, and collective bargaining are prohibited.

Instead, there is one State-controlled puppet union, the Cuban Workers Central, which reacts to every whim of the Cuban tyrant.

For example, in 1992, when Cuban ports worker Rafael Gutierrez attempted to establish an independent labor union, the Cuban Workers Trade Union, he was arrested and detained at State security headquarters, for subversion and distribution of enemy propaganda.

Mr. Gutierrez was later released, but was not able to find employment due to the regime's persecution against him.

In 1994, Mr. Gutierrez was denied a visa by the Cuban regime to speak at the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions Human Rights Commission, where he would have condemned the regimes' human rights violations.

Finally, tired of the repression against him, Mr. Gutierrez was one of the thousands of Cubans who sought their freedom, aboard a rickety raft, and was one of the refugees held at the Guantanamo Naval Base.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

More deplorable and tragic is how the Cuban regime is now using its repression of workers' rights to attract foreign investment to the island.

Last August, Miguel Taladrid, the regime's Deputy Minister of Foreign Investment and Economic Cooperation, stated that, "The current system is more convenient. We are free from labor conflicts; nowhere else in the world could you get this tranquility."

Unfortunately, the regimes' promotion of its repression of the Cuban worker, is having the desired effect on investors.

A businessman from the Dominican Republic had this to say, "The main reason why I chose to invest in Cuba, rather than in the Dominican Republic, was the assurance by the Cubans that I would not have to negotiate, or be forced to sign, collective agreements with trade unions."

He added that, "The Cuban Government is attracting European investors by promising cheap labor and the absence of free trade unions."

This tragic scenario of workers' rights in Cuba is apparently alien to some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, who hosted and expressed their great admiration for Castro during his recent trip to New York City.

My Democrat colleagues from that great city all have excellent lifetime voting records supporting workers' rights in the United States, according to the AFL-CIO. One of them has 100 percent lifetime AFL-CIO record, while the other two have a 95 and 94 percent rating.

Apparently, my colleagues are all for worker rights, except, of course, when those rights might interfere or harm their relationship with their good buddy, Fidel Castro.

For not a peep was heard from them, condemning the repression of workers' rights in Cuba by Castro.

Maybe we should not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues would not want to tarnish their sweet relationship with the tyrant.

After all, they spend a lot of time and effort to assure that the tyrant received a warm greeting in New York City.

One of our colleagues made a heartwarming gift to Castro: a pair of boxing gloves claiming that, "Fidel is No. 1."

Yet another one could not contain himself and repeatedly hugged the tyrant and applauded Castro's rhetoric of being for the working people of the world.

Apparently, my colleagues do not care much for those like Mr. Gutierrez and others who dared to challenge the regimes' repression, for never did they bring up the subject of workers' rights to Castro.

The same congressional colleagues oppose the U.S. embargo against Cas-

tro and, instead, promote free and open trade with the tyrant, as an instrument to push him from power.

Oddly, some of them did not promote these views in Haiti or South Africa, where some supported economic embargoes against the undemocratic regimes of those two countries to help bring freedom and democracy.

My colleagues might be for workers' rights in the United States, and Castro might give the impression that he supports working people of the world, but neither my colleagues nor Castro show much concern for the working people of Cuba.

If an award were to be given for hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, my three New York Democrat colleagues who cheered Castro in New York would win hands down.

Today is trick or treat day. But our New York colleagues got an early start on Halloween. They treated Castro well; they tried to trick the people of the United States and Cuba. But freedom-loving people will not be fooled. Democracy must come to my enslaved native homeland.

VOTE AGAINST H.R. 1833, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I must say, as I stand here to discuss the bill H.R. 1833, it is appropriate we do this, I guess, on Halloween, because this is such a ghoulish issue and it is so very distressing to me that this body is moving forward to deal with this issue.

In America, it is wonderful because most people when they become pregnant have no problems. But not all people. Last year, this country was fortunate in that it only had to have about 600 late-term abortions. But let me tell you, every one of those was terribly critical, dealing with the life of the mother or fetal abnormalities that could not be treated in utero, that could be incompatible with life, totally incompatible with life and could harm the mother and her future ability to go on and have a normal family.

Luckily, most people are not going to be affected by this bill. But let me tell you, for anyone who is going to be affected by this bill, they are going to be outraged.

As the gentlewoman from New York talked about, when any family has decided to have a child and is very excited and very enthusiastic about it, and these are the people we are talking about, and they suddenly get toward the end and find some horrendous, awful thing has derailed their dream, if they find the Congress of the United States has started practicing medicine without a license and has decided that

the safest procedure a doctor might recommend cannot be given, a procedure that would allow that family to go forward and have another child without really threatening the reproductive organs of the woman or her life is no longer allowed by order of the U.S. Congress, that the fact that her life cannot be taken into account or anything else, I think that family is going to be totally outraged, has every reason to be totally outraged. You have got to really ask, why do we think we have that power?

What we are going to be doing as we deal with this issue is we are really attempting to demonize women who are put in this position and demonize doctors who are trying to treat them. We are trying to say, this is a procedure that is so awful and so terrible that only demons would get into this.

Well, let us think about this. Is trying to save the life of the mother something that you would demonize someone for? If you have a fetus with abnormalities that are not correctable, that are incompatible with life, and we are talking about very severe things, like absence of a head, brain outside the head, one heart, one chamber of the heart, these types of things, where the fetus can die in utero and then start decomposing and cause all sorts of life-threatening things to the mother.

□ 0915

Are we just saying to her, "Well, risk it. You risk it, and that is what you are going to do?" If we pass this bill, we are really rolling back the tremendous progress this country has made on safe motherhood. If you look at earlier years, we were running 800 deaths per 100,000 births. We are now down to 8, but part of that is because we have allowed doctors and families, when they get into these awful, awful, awful conflicts to sit down and decide what the family wants to do and what medical professionals think is the best to do, and we are going to take that away. We are going to take that away if we vote on the bill 1833. We are going to say to them, we know better, and we are going to go back, rolling back the safe motherhood progress that we have made in this country.

You are going to hear all sorts of things on this floor. I beg people to, please, look at the doctor's testimony about how the charts you see are inaccurate and wrong, how the terms you hear are not medically accurate terms, and they do not describe accurately what transpires, how the person that they base all of this on was really fraudulent; it was a person who never participated in these events. We have letters and documentation on all of that.

So here we are taking this urban myth, blowing it up, trying to demonize, trying to undo and get Congress involved in something that is a great,

great tragedy, and if we pass this bill, we are only going to make these tragedies much greater.

I plead with my colleagues to find their spines, to stand up and to really not get involved in this demonization of women, doctors, and their families who have nothing but terrible choices to make.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, as we hear the words and the heated rhetoric from the White House regarding the budget deficit crisis, regarding President Clinton's positions on the budget, I thought it would be important for us just to step back, because things move so quickly in Washington and have moved so quickly in the past few years, I think it is important we step back and take a perspective and take a long look at what the President's position has been on budgets, on taxes, and on fiscal matters since he first got elected in 1992.

First of all, we really can go back even to the campaign. Remember when he was campaigning through the snows of New Hampshire and his campaign was in crisis because of some political scandals that were shaking him up. The response was to go to the New Hampshire voters in 1992 and say, "I am proposing a tax break for middle class Americans." I do not know how many people remember that, but he did it, and when he was pressed, Bill Clinton, the candidate, held up his plan. He said, "Others talk about it. I have got a plan right here that is going to give middle class Americans tax cuts."

It helped him survive the crisis in New Hampshire, moved beyond New Hampshire, eventually got elected as President of the United States, and in large part ridiculed George Bush for breaking his "no new taxes" pledge. Well, all of America sat around and watched President Clinton after he got elected take to the airwaves for the first time and said, "Oops, I made a mistake. Instead of giving middle class Americans tax relief, I am actually going to tax you more than any President in the history of the United States ever has. I am going to propose Btu taxes, I am going to propose taxes on senior citizens, going to increase their taxes on Social Security up to 85 percent, I am going to lower the earning limits for senior citizens from \$34,000 to \$14,000, so senior citizens cannot remain productive after they retire without being penalized by the Federal Government."

Of course, the Republicans at that point did not go out and say that Presi-

dent Clinton wanted senior citizens to die like the administration is now saying that we want senior citizens to die simply because we have got the guts to save Medicare for him, but it just showed how the President flip-flopped back and forth, back and forth, and fast forward 2 years to the speech he made a few weeks ago. I know the House Democrats absolutely have to love when Bill Clinton, after yanking them along for the ride said, "It may surprise you, but I think I raised taxes too much also," and then blamed it on the Republicans. Now I went back over that vote tally, and there was not a single Republican on the House or Senate side that voted to raise the taxes, but somehow Bill Clinton flip-flopped again and said, "Yes, I know I raised taxes too much on you, but it was those Republicans' fault." I am a bit baffled, but that is OK. Bill Clinton was baffled.

The next day he flip-flopped it again and blamed it on talking after 7 p.m. at night, and said, "My mom always told me do not go out and speak after 7 p.m. at night, because you never know what you are going to say." I have a question for the President: What is he going to do when all the Presidential debates coming up next year are going to be after 7 p.m.? So what is he going to do? I mean, if I were running against the President, I would turn to him and say, Mr. President, it is past 7 p.m. Do we believe you on this issue, or is your mom right again, or are you just making it up as you go along? It would be funny if it were not so frightening.

This is a question of leadership. And you do not have to go back 2 years to look at the multiple flips-flops on the budget issue, go back 2 months, look at the first budget he proposed after the election, the Clinton 1 budget. It was voted down 99 to 0 in the Senate. It was voted down 99 to 0 because it continued sky rising deficits.

He said the balanced budget is not necessary. He proposed a second budget. It was voted down 96 to 0, and soon after the polls showed that 88 percent of Americans wanted a balanced budget this year and wanted tax cuts also, miraculously he flip-flopped again, which leads us to what happened last week where he said that he thought he raised taxes too much on Americans, but it was the Republicans' fault.

I mean, now what do we do as Americans? When our President speaks on budget issues, when he speaks on tax issues, when he speaks on deficit issues, what do we believe? Where do we go for leadership from the White House? It is absolutely frightening, because he continues to flip-flop and continues to look at the polls instead of looking at what is in America's best interest.

I ask him to follow the Republican Party's lead, balance the budget, balance it now for the sake of future generations.

PRESERVE ROE VERSUS WADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about H.R. 1833, a bill which would criminalize some late-term abortions.

First of all, I would like to say, H.R. 1833, Mr. CANADY's bill to criminalize specific late-term abortions is a cruel attempt to make a political point.

Make no mistake about it, ladies and gentlemen, the Canady bill—with all of the emotional rhetoric, with all of the graphic pictures, with all of the exaggerated testimony—is the first frontal attack on Roe versus Wade by the new majority. Plain and simple. The new majority wants to do away with Roe; the radical right wants to do away with Roe; and the Canady bill is the first step.

So let us be honest about what this debate is really about.

Next, I want to talk about who will be harmed by the Canady bill. This legislation seeks to prohibit a wide array of abortion techniques which are used in the late stages of a pregnancy when and if the life of the mother is in danger or a fetus is so malformed that it has no chance to survive.

The procedures which the Canady bill seeks to prohibit are used very, very rarely. In fact, less than 600 times per year, for all late term abortions and, less than 100 a year for this procedure. These particular abortion techniques are used in extreme and tragic cases. Like a fetus with no brain; or a fetus with missing organs; or a fetus with the spine growing outside of the body. The procedures which will be banned by the Canady bill are used when the fetus has zero chance of survival.

If women are forced to carry these malformed fetuses to term, they are in danger of chronic hemorrhaging, permanent infertility, or death.

That is what H.R. 1833 is all about.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I know that this is a difficult issue to talk about on the floor of the House of Representatives. I do not think that this subject belongs here. I do not think that Congress should be making decisions on surgical procedures.

Women and their doctors need to make these decisions, not Members of Congress. So let us put the decision back where it belongs. Give women the right to make their own decisions. Let us preserve Roe versus Wade. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1833 when it is considered later this week.

THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California

[Mr. KIM] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was not able to complete my statement, and after that I had numerous phone calls and letters asking me to complete. Why? Because the American people deserve to know about the EITC, earned income tax credit.

Many people do not know. I did not know until I joined Congress. This perhaps is the most severe attack, calling it mean spirited cutting, putting all of the poor people out in the cold.

I would like to tell you, the American people, what is really happening on this EITC. First of all, what is EITC? That was established back in 1975. Originally the intent was good, to try to help those people who actually are working, those people who are working, but they do not earn enough to support their families. What we are trying to do is Government subsidize them, give them a credit. They call it a negative income tax. They call it subsidy to the working poor. Excellent idea. Nobody is complaining. I think it is a good idea.

The Republicans are putting it, and the Democrats are putting it. What happened then?

If you make less than \$26,000 with kids, then Government again gives you a little subsidy. Now, what happened is this program became out of control. Look at what happened here.

When this started in 1975, it only cost the Government \$1.2 billion. Then about 10 years later it cost about \$2.5 billion. But since then, we, Congress, keep changing the law to be expanding, it raised income level, and the eligibility has kept changing. Now you do not have to have a family. Anybody can receive this EITC credit without having any family. Even a single person can do it.

From then on, look what happened. Costs have gone up, gone up 1,000 percent, from \$2.5 to \$25 billion, absolutely out of control. This is what is happening now.

Why do we not recognize this serious problem? I do not know. Colleagues have been dominating, controlling our Congress 40 years. Why did they not address this problem previously? A bureaucrat, can they not see it? It is out of control, a 1,000-percent increase. Why do they not come up with some idea to control this thing? We did, in the budget reconciliation package.

Let me tell you what we are proposing to do. We said, "By golly, we cannot let this go." If you do not think so, costs have gone up to \$36 billion. What we are trying to do is control cost, bring it down a little bit, down to \$31 billion, from \$36 billion to \$31 billion, trying to control this out-of-control spending speed. Now, what is wrong with that? You call that a deep cut? I mean, gutting it? Call that a mean spirited cut? All we are trying to do is

trying to control this out-of-control spending.

Why is it? Because there is a lot of waste and fraud going on. According to a report, it said more than 1 million people are receiving the EITC illegally, and GAO study says 40 percent of EITC recipients are illegally receiving more money than they deserve.

□ 0930

The waste and fraud is totally out of control. That is what we are trying to control.

What we proposed on this reconciliation package is as follows: No. 1, we are going to stop giving those folks money if they do not have any children to support. We are going back to our original intent, just folks who have children. What is wrong with that?

Second, we are going to eliminate waste and fraud. We are going to make it tough for them to apply for the EITC credit. They have to have proof. Those two combinations alone can save \$5 billion, easily. By doing it, we can balance the budget within 7 years.

Now, what does that mean, balancing the budget in 7 years? According to the Wharton Business School, they predict if we balance the budget, the interest will go down by 4 percent. All right. Even if interest rates fall by even 1 percent, the family who currently has a \$100,000 mortgage at 8 percent would save \$30,000. Can you imagine if we balance the budget, if you own a House with a mortgage of \$100,000 at an 8-percent interest rate, you can save \$30,000? Further they say GNP will go up 28 percent, creating 20 million additional jobs. That is what we are doing. Mr. Speaker, come on, we are not trying to put those people out in the cold.

PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BILL IS BAD LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak against H.R. 1833, the so-called partial birth abortion bill. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I had heard that this bill had been introduced, and, like I think a lot of Americans today, I thought, what the heck is that? I called around trying to find out what this procedure was, but it turned out that I knew someone who had to utilize this procedure.

As the Speaker knows, I have been in this body for under 11 months. I started in January. But for many years I was a member of the board of supervisors in Santa Clara County, and I served with a wonderful woman, Susan Wilson, who is a typical American person. She grew up in Texas. She was a cheerleader, she married her high school boy, and they moved to San Jose, where she volunteered in her Methodist church, taught

sewing, and was a youth counselor. She had three fine sons.

A year ago April, Susie was so excited to tell me she was going to have another granddaughter. Her son Bill and daughter-in-law Vickie were expecting their third child. It was going to be a girl. They even picked out the name Abigail.

Towards Easter time they found out a very sad thing. They found out late, it had been missed in the early tests, that Abigail would not live. Abigail's brain had formed outside of her cranial cavity, and the brain tissue that had formed was malformed. This baby could not live. It was a devastating piece of news for Susie and for Vickie and Bill and for all of us who loved and knew that family. We cried a lot.

But one of the things that was important to Vickie and Bill and to all of us was that Vickie not also die, because they have two children who need a mother.

So Vickie and Bill did as much research as they could to see, could the child be saved? They found out regrettably, no, and they found out what was Vickie's risk. They found out, much to their dismay, that unless there was an intervention, Vickie could die. Certainly Abigail was going to die in any case.

They hoped to have another child. They found if they did not do something, that Vickie's possibility of having another child would be seriously threatened. So they did engage in a late term abortion to save Vickie's life and to preserve the opportunity to have another child. They know now that little Abigail is in heaven, and they are grateful for that, and they know that Vickie is still alive to be the mother, the good mother she is, to her children.

In the Committee on the Judiciary I heard a lot of angry rhetoric, but I did not hear a willingness to listen to the truth, to the real families that have real tragedies that they have to cope with. And I know that they do not need the guidance and help of the Congress of the United States on this very personal and horrible situation. What they need is the help and guidance of God, not the Congress.

A CALL TO COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, a call to the community. An honest conversation on race, reconciliation, and responsibility. At the close of the 20th century, the toxic issue of race confronts society everywhere. It is at the core of the crisis facing American cities. This working document in its

final form will be offered to the American people by political, business, religious, artistic, academic, and community leaders representing a broad spectrum of opinion. The aim is to rally all Americans around a vision of community that transcends our divisions.

Mr. Speaker, America is at a crossroads. One road leads to community; the other to the chaos of competing identities and interests. We have all hurt one another, often unconsciously, in ways we would never intend. We need each other. We need to eradicate the scourge of racial division. We must demonstrate that our diversity is our greatest strength and that out of this diversity is rising a new American community. We can offer hope to a world torn by divisions of every kind.

We invite every citizen to join us in a renewed commitment to an American community based on justice, reconciliation and excellence. The original promise of this country, that out of a rich diversity of peoples a great nation would rise, has only partially been fulfilled. This unique experiment remains incomplete because the promise of equal opportunity and dignity for all has not been fully realized. Much of the distrust, resentment and fear in America today is rooted in our unacknowledged and unhealed racial history.

For many of us, race determines where we live, where we send our children to school and where we worship. Because racism is deeply embedded in the institutions of our society, individuals are often insulated from making personal decisions based on conscious racial feelings and do not experience the daily burden that their brothers and sisters of color have to carry. We must change the structures which perpetuate economic and racial separation. But no unseen hand can wipe prejudice away. The ultimate answer to the racial problem lies in our willingness to obey the unenforceable.

The new American community will flow from a spirit of giving freely without demanding anything in return. In the new American community, when any one individual is injured, exploited or demeaned, all of us will feel the pain and be diminished. It will be a place where hearts can put down roots and where each feels accepted and at home. Some painful memories cannot be erased. But forgiving is not forgetting; it is letting go of the hurt.

To build this new American community, we must empower individuals to take charge of their lives and take care of their communities. In cities across America, bold experiments are taking place. Citizens have initiated honest conversations—between people of all backgrounds—on matters of race, reconciliation and responsibility. They have chosen to move beyond blame and guilt, beyond hatred and fear, deciding to face the past with courage and hon-

esty. They are demonstrating that through honesty, a willingness to embrace each other's painful experiences, and with God's power to change us, the wounds of the past can be healed and our Nation become one community.

This approach calls us to a new concept of partnership and responsibility. It means: Listening carefully and respectfully to each other and to the whole community; bringing people together, not in confrontation but in trust, to tackle the most urgent needs of the community; searching for solutions, focussing on what is right rather than who is right; building lasting relationships outside our comfort zone; honoring each person, appealing to the best qualities in everyone, and refusing to stereotype the other group; holding ourselves, communities and institutions accountable in areas where change is needed; and recognizing that the energy for fundamental change requires a moral and spiritual transformation in the human spirit.

PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION ACT NOT GOOD LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1833. As a mother of five wonderful children who supports a woman's right to choose, I respect the opposition that our colleagues have to that right to choose. Indeed, we have had some very heated debates on that subject on this floor. But today we are breaking new ground, and it is, I think, most unfortunate for America's women and America's families that we have a bill, before us, the so-called partial birth abortion act.

Mr. Speaker, I strenuously object to the procedures of this House that would allow a bill with that name and that misrepresentation to come to the floor. The makers of that motion know that all abortions taking place in the third trimester are for reasons of serious fetal abnormality or risk to the life or health of the mother.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, though medical science has developed sophisticated testing to determine potential medical problems in the pregnancy, often these tests are not fully accurate until later in the pregnancy. Some women may undergo several ultrasounds and other tests and be told that all is well, only to have a devastating anomaly detected at the 28th week of pregnancy or beyond. Other women may be diagnosed with cancer or kidney failure late in pregnancy or have a previous condition such as brittle diabetes suddenly flare-up so seriously that their own health and even their lives are threatened. These women are faced with the painful and

deeply personal choice of ending a wanted pregnancy.

The intact DNE abortion procedure which H.R. 1833 seeks to outlaw is for many women in these circumstances the safest medical option available. It saves the life and protects the health and safety of the mother. This is also used when the fetus cannot sustain life. It also enables the mother to go on more safely to have other children, which outlawing this procedure might prevent her from doing.

The bill also does not take into account the indescribable agony faced by women and families eagerly awaiting a wanted child upon discovering late in pregnancy that their dreams are shattered. Under this bill, women could be forced to continue their pregnancy, even if it is certain, certain, Mr. Speaker, that the fetus will not survive birth. This is cruel, inhumane, and medically inappropriate. The bill is bad medicine and bad policy.

I know that this is a painful and personal matter for the people affected by it. It should not be a decision by this Congress. It should be a decision by a woman, her family, her doctor, and her God, and I urge our colleagues to oppose this legislation and leave the decision with the family.

RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will, I believe, begin the process of examination of the electric industry. My bill would repeal prospectively section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978. This legislation is only one of many important aspects of the electric industry that must be explored and opened up for discussion. I am hopeful that this legislation serves as an instigator of a much larger debate. I now have 15 cosponsors. It is a bipartisan bill.

My only interest in introducing this bill lies in achieving the most efficient and most cost-effective means of electric generation for America's ratepayers. Prospective repeal of PURPA represents a positive step in that direction. It is important to note that PURPA is a mandate, regardless of its intent. It substitutes government intervention where the marketplace should dictate. Furthermore, PURPA has not jump-started the renewable energy generation industry as was the act's intent—only 6 percent of PURPA generated power comes from nonrenewables.

Nonetheless, there are other important concerns surrounding the repeal of PURPA. It is important to note that, just as I support deregulation through the repeal of PURPA, I also support

the notion of more comprehensive Federal deregulation legislation that would provide for greater and freer competition in power generation.

I truly understand the concerns of those in opposition to my bill—I recognize that their industry has come about largely because of PURPA. I also recognize that not all PURPA generators abuse the system. In fact, a Georgia-Pacific plant located in my district generates its own power from the plant's waste, but sells none back into the system. In this instance, PURPA encouraged innovation and self-sufficiency, a notion that I strongly believe in: It is the American way. But the American way does not rely on a mandate; it dictates deregulation over regulation.

House Energy and Power Subcommittee Chairman DAN SCHAEFER has indicated that he intends to hold a series of hearings on the variety of issues involved in electricity deregulation and reform. I support his efforts and look forward to the opportunity to finally address these important issues.

Indeed, by introducing this legislation today, I believe that I am helping to initiate debate, not only on this important issue, but on the whole gamut of issues surrounding the regulation of the electric generation industry. I am anxious to work with Chairman SCHAEFER, Chairman BLILEY, the House Committee on Commerce, and all other interested parties as Congress moves forward with its comprehensive examination of this industry.

Everyone will agree that we must begin to explore a move toward an electricity industry that is based on competition, market force, and lower prices for ratepayers. This is certainly my objective as I introduce this necessary first piece of electricity reform legislation.

VOTE AGAINST H.R. 1833

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of good health care and good public policy, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1833. In the first 6 months of the 104th Congress, 12 antichoice bills passed. This one, H.R. 1833, is by far the worst.

The bottom line is, H.R. 1833 represents an unprecedented politically motivated intrusion into the practice of sound and acceptable clinical medicine.

Here are the facts choice opponents purposely ignore. Abortion in late term pregnancy is rare, very rare. Only four one-hundredths of a 1 percent of abortions are performed at 26 weeks. H.R. 1833 provides no exceptions for cases in which the procedure would be necessary to preserve a woman's health or

life. The bill presents a direct constitutional challenge to Roe versus Wade.

If facts do not convince you, maybe this family's story will. Vickie Smith, a mother of two children, ended a wanted pregnancy because the fetus had abnormalities incompatible with life. A large part of its brain was formed outside the skull. Because Vickie went through the safest procedure available, she was able to have more children. She is now expecting her third child. With the safest procedure known, Vickie could have become infertile or could have died.

In the interests of good health and public policy, please vote against H.R. 1833. Do not allow an already cruel situation to be politicized. It is bad public policy and bad medicine.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the beginning of time, O God, Your benediction of grace has not changed; through the steadfast heritage of righteous people, Your blessed work has been accomplished; through Your faithful and abiding word, we have been enriched and the meaning of life has been proclaimed, and through Your love we have been forgiven and redeemed and made new. On this new day we offer our thanksgivings for the bounty of Your blessings to us and to all people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

JOIN THE EFFORT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, today is Halloween—the Democrat's favorite day. All this year Democrats have made a concerted effort to scare people. They have tried to scare children with school lunch horror stories. They have tried to scare seniors with their Medicare tales from the crypt. And they have tried to scare the poor with EITC ghost stories.

Democrats have lost the battle of ideas, plain and simple. The only weapon they have is distortion and fear. They have no mandate. They have no positive message of hope. And the only way they can influence policy is to scare the wits out of the American people.

Madam Speaker, fear is not a hallmark of sound political leadership and scaring people is what bullies do.

I challenge our friends on the other side to stop the horror stories, take off your masks, and join our effort to save Medicare, reform welfare, cut taxes on families, and balance the budget.

TRICK OR TREAT

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I think it is appropriate here on Halloween to be focused on trick or treat. Today we have an opportunity to do that on the question of reforming this Congress and the issue of gifts and lobby reform, whether there will be more tricks for the public and more treats for the Members of this Congress. Since the opening of this Congress, our Republican colleagues have had repeated opportunities to join us in the type of bipartisan reform of lobby and gift ban that has occurred across the rotunda in the U.S. Senate, thus far, whether it was on day 1 of this Congress, whether it was on June 20, whether it was on June 22, or whether it was on September 6, our Republican colleagues have thus, with the exception of I think two of them, refused to join us in that kind of bipartisan clean-up. What better day than Halloween to

say it is time to stop tricking the American people and stop taking treats from the lobby. It is time to get about cleaning up this House and doing the business of the American people.

PRESIDENTIAL TRICK OR TREAT?

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, tonight is Halloween and Americans want to know if they will get a trick or treat from their President.

The President has told Americans that he wants these four things in the Federal budget:

No. 1, a plan that will balance the Federal budget in 7 years.

No. 2, a plan that will save Medicare from bankruptcy.

No. 3, a plan that will end welfare as we know it.

No. 4, a plan that will cut taxes for families and reduce the capital gains tax to spur job creation and economic growth.

Madam Speaker, the President has never presented such a plan. But the House and the Senate have passed and will shortly send to the President a budget reconciliation plan that will achieve all four of the President's goals.

The question is: Will the President trick Americans and veto the only budget plan that will achieve his goals or will the President treat Americans and just sign the balanced budget?

Madam Speaker, Americans want to know what their President will give them this Halloween, trick or treat.

YESTERDAY'S VOTE ON BOSNIAN RESOLUTION A MISTAKE

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, the vote that we took yesterday on Bosnia, even though it was overwhelming, was a mistake. It undermined the American President, and it undermined America's position as the leader of the free world. I think we will live to regret it.

If you talk the talk, you have got to be willing to walk the walk. We have poured billions of dollars into NATO to protect the integrity of Europe's borders, to promote democracy, and to make good on our vow after the holocaust of World War II that it would never happen again. The Bosnian war is a reflection of the fact that we have allowed it to happen again. If it happens here, it can happen in other places.

The fact is that the war in Bosnia occurred because of a violation of Bosnia's borders by Serbia's invasion with soldiers and armaments. The fact

is that the massacre of Bosnian Muslims is the worst holocaust to occur in Europe since World War II. The fact is that America needs to be a leader in securing peace in that area of the world and in fact throughout the world, and we cannot assume that mantle of world leadership if we deliberately prevent our President from acting responsibly and effectively.

KEEPING PROMISES

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Madam Speaker, approximately a year ago, the American people spoke loud and clear when they elected a Republican majority in Congress for the first time in 40 years. They wanted us to come to Washington and keep our promises to cut spending and reform the way Washington works. We have kept our promises.

We have passed a balanced budget. We have passed real welfare reform. We have passed tax cuts for middle class families and small businesses, and we have downsized the huge Federal bureaucracy.

Madam Speaker, the new Republican majority has kept our promises we made last year. We have delivered what the people want. Now it is time for President Clinton to keep his campaign promises, too.

STEALING ALL BUT THE FAMILY JEWELS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, documents now reveal that Alan Greenspan misled us, the Bush White House used phony numbers. NAFTA is Halloween all right, inside out. It is a trick. Certainly not a treat.

The news that breaks today might be good for the South if you think about it. You already lost in the first 9 months of this year 100,000 textile jobs. Fruit of the Loom is laying off 3,200 people and moving to Mexico.

I have heard about people stealing your pants. This is the first time somebody has stolen our goochies, ladies and gentleman.

While Congress is debating 4-year deals, 5-year deals, 7-year deals, I predict in 1999 Congress will be debating a 10-year deal. The reason is very simple. America will never balance the budget, let alone pay one dime off on this massive debt without jobs. As long as the good-paying jobs are going overseas, we will continue to lose our pants.

Thank God it could have been worse. They could have stolen our family jewels.

CELEBRATING HALLOWEEN ALL YEAR

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, as many other colleagues of mine who come to this well have noted, today is in fact Halloween. In listening to the Clinton liberals here on the other side talk over the past several months, I have come to the conclusion that they have really been trying to celebrate Halloween all year long.

Madam Speaker, it really makes for perverse verse. Because when we talk about Medicare, the liberals howl about Mediscare; and when we speak of Medicaid, the liberals moan of Medifraid; and when we pass the Balanced Budget Act, the liberals scream, "Give us your tax dollars, Jack;" and when we discuss welfare reform, the liberals bitterly cry, "Oh, please keep the norm."

Madam Speaker, the liberals have tried their fear tactics, and they have cried wolf once too often. The American people want us to balance the budget, reform welfare, and preserve and protect Medicare and Medicaid.

Madam Speaker, let us get serious. Friends, join us and let us give the American people what they really want.

104TH CONGRESS SCARIEST ON HALLOWEEN

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the scariest things this Halloween are the tricks and treats being doled out by the Republican-led Congress. The problem is that the American people get all the tricks, while lobbyists get all the treats.

When lobbyists come knocking on the doors of this House there are plenty of GOP goodies to go around. If you come dressed as a golfer—you will be treated to a gift ban bill that does not ban lobbyist-paid golf trips.

If you come dressed as a corporate big-wig or millionaire—you will be treated to more than your share of the Republican's \$245 billion tax cut. And, if you come dressed as a doctor—you will be treated to 3 billion dollars' worth of goodies in the GOP Medicare bill.

But, if you come dressed as a senior citizen, a student or a veteran, a working man or woman, there are no treats, only tricks. The scariest thing this Halloween may just be the 104th Congress.

GO BIG RED

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to settle a bet.

About a week ago, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] challenged me to a small wager on the outcome of the Colorado Buffalo-Nebraska Cornhusker football game. I accepted that challenge, and the Cornhuskers did not let me down.

The decisive score: Nebraska 44, Colorado 21. Nebraska apparently is well on its way to defending its national championship, and perhaps another national championship game in Arizona in the Fiesta Bowl.

This is the cap that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] will be wearing around Capitol Hill today. I want you all to take a good look at it, and I hope that you will all take the time to congratulate him on the victory of the team whose cap he is sporting.

I know, Madam Speaker, that this time is devoted to serious issues affecting each of our districts, but football is serious in Nebraska as well as Colorado. I can think of few things of any more interest or that unite people more than football.

Go Big Red.

KILLING MEDICARE

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, the Republicans are cutting Medicare by \$270 billion. Why such an extreme cut?

The Republican Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH, tells seniors he wants to save Medicare. The Republican Senate leader says he wants to save Medicare. But what do they say when they are not talking to elderly voters?

Last week the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] said, "We don't get rid of Medicare in round one because we don't think that's politically smart."

Mr. DOLE told a large group from the insurance industry, he is proud of his 1965 vote against the creation of Medicare.

The Republicans are not saving Medicare, they are making extreme cuts in Medicare to pay for the tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans.

They have made it clear, in their own words, this is only round one. The Republicans intend to kill Medicare.

CORNHUSKERS TOP BUFFALOES

(Mr. ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a frightening performance by the Nebraska Cornhusker football team this past Saturday, Octo-

ber 28, against the University of Colorado Golden Buffaloes.

Nebraska quarterback Tommie Frazier and his Cornhuskers bedeviled and bewitched the CU team, proving to the Nation why Nebraska was the national champion last year, and why the team is ranked No. 1 this week.

The Buffs are still haunted by a fumble that was ruled dead, and which cost them a touchdown. And although the Buffs fought a hard battle, they jinxed themselves with untold penalties.

I will be doing my Halloween bit today by wearing a Nebraska football cap, as I promised my good friend, Congressman BILL BARRETT of Nebraska. And I am giving that Cornhusker a sack of candy corn, in the hopes of sweetening Nebraska's chances to repeat as national champs.

□ 1015

MEDICARE: SAVING IT OR DESTROYING IT?

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, last week the Gingrich plan passed Congress. If you make \$20,000 a year, your taxes will go up. If you make 10 times that amount of money, you will get a several thousand dollar tax break.

The Gingrich plan cuts student loans to middle class families and cuts Medicare \$270 billion in order to pay for a tax break for America's wealthiest people.

Why do they want to destroy Medicare? Listen to Speaker GINGRICH's own words when he spoke to a group of insurance executives:

Now, we didn't get rid of it in round one because we don't think that that's politically smart and we don't think that's the right way to go through a transition. But we believe it's going to wither on the vine because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it.

Madam Speaker, that is wrong to want to destroy Medicare, particularly at the same time that you say you are trying to save it.

STOP SUBSIDIZING LOBBYISTS

(Mr. WICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, I rise today as an advocate for the taxpayer whose hard-earned dollars are going to subsidize Washington lobbyists. The lobbyists I speak of directly benefit from the Federal grant system, designed to help people and charities, not line the pockets of inside-the-beltway lobbyists.

When I tell my constituents that the Federal Government gives away over

\$39 billion per year in grant money with little or no strings attached, they tell me to stop this business-as-usual attitude in Washington.

If these groups were not spending money on political and partisan activities, they would have much more money for the services they are intended to perform and they would not have to take as much—or any—money from hard-working Americans.

The Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich amendment to the Treasury-Postal conference report would require Federal grantees to open their books and be accountable to the taxpayers who fund them. Sunshine, Madam Speaker. Let us show the taxpayers how their money is being spent. It is only fair and the right thing to do.

As President of the freshman class, I can tell you that this is the kind of reform we promised the American people last November—let us deliver in the 104th Congress.

MEDICARE

(Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to convey the frustrations that so many senior citizens expressed to me while I was in my district the past weekend. I can picture one of the seniors who approached me and begged, "please do not let them take my only source of medical insurance away, I can't afford to pay a dime more." This little lady was talking about the increase in her Medicare premiums that is being proposed by the Republican Congress.

Madam Speaker, this lady's request resonated throughout the Second Congressional District in Mississippi. These seniors cannot afford to pay more so that those wealthy Americans can receive a tax break. Can you imagine a poor senior citizen, receiving only \$400 a month in Social Security income, who currently spends \$46.10 a month for health care premiums now having to pay \$97.70? That's over a 100-percent increase in premiums. That's outrageous. That's cruel. Is this the Government that was created by the people and for the people? The question now is, which people? Ask a low-income senior citizen and they will tell you: the rich people.

How can we, as responsible Members of Congress, advocate raising a poor senior citizen's premium to pay for a tax cut for those Americans who can live without it. This is not democracy but hypocrisy.

The Republican plan to cut \$270 billion out of Medicare is a cruel and devastating attack on our mothers and grandmothers. Do you really think that your rich friends need a tax cut this much? I do not think so. Republicans please think about what you are doing and spare the pain that you are causing our seniors with your tax hike on their Medicare. The

over 388,000 Medicare beneficiaries in Mississippi beg you not to jeopardize their health insurance. Let us not make these seniors choose between food and medical care.

STOP THOSE WHO WOULD SAVE CASTRO

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, they cannot have it both ways on Castro. Here, Business Week quotes a fellow named Andreas who is a businessman who is lobbying for Castro. It says the embargo has been a total failure; it ought to be ended.

Then you have got Time Magazine saying the purpose of Castro's visit to New York was very specific: He is desperate to end the embargo. With no more subsidies from the Soviet Union, the economy has ground to a halt. Normalized trade with a huge market 90 miles north would make all the difference for Castro. If the embargo is not working, why is Castro so desperate to get rid of it?

We have got two groups lobbying for Castro. We have the capitalists who want to take advantage of the slave economy and exploit Cuban workers, and we have the ideologues, like a couple of our colleagues, who drooled all over Castro to give him gifts when he went to New York. They are in concert now. They are in coalition.

But we will press forward with Helms-Burton. The American people cannot stand Castro. They know what he is doing to the Cuban people. We are going to succeed, in stopping him. We are going to succeed in passing Helms-Burton and preventing this coalition of capitalists and ideologues from saving him.

WHAT IS THE TRAIN WRECK?

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, we are coming to the close of this congressional session, but it is the toughest part. You see, the Republicans have passed the Gingrich budget which makes deep cuts in Medicare, imposes new taxes on working families and, frankly, President Clinton and many of the congressional Democrats have said we find this unacceptable.

So how will Speaker GINGRICH force through these changes? What he suggested we do is, frankly, to have the so-called train wreck, in other words, we do not appropriate money for Federal agencies so they have to turn out the lights, and even worse, we would basically not extend the debt ceiling of the United States as is necessary.

What is the debt ceiling? It is basically the full faith and credit of this

Government behind our financial obligations. Now, there is a coalition of 130 Republicans led by a Michigan Republican Member of this House who has come up with suggestions to the Treasury Department printed in this morning's Washington Times about how they can get by even if we do not extend the debt ceiling. Do you know what they suggest, these Republicans? They suggest that we do not send the refunds to people for their income tax returns next year. That is one of their bright ideas.

The second one is, do not put money in the Social Security trust fund. That is the height of irresponsibility.

A BALANCED BUDGET AND THE DEBT CEILING

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would suggest to the previous speaker, learn the facts and that would enhance everybody's conclusion of what is best for this country.

I am usually not critical on a partisan basis. But looking at what some of the Democrats have suggested, looking at what Secretary Rubin looks into that television camera and tells the American people is less than the honest truth.

I think it is important, No. 1, that we end up with a balanced budget in this country. I think it is important that we use the single, sole leverage that we have, and that is holding back the vote on yet again increasing the debt ceiling of the United States of America. We have increased this debt ceiling 77 times since 1940. It has become a matter of tradition. I say it is enough.

I say let us do what was done in 1985 and 1986 during Gramm-Rudman. Let us do what was done to President Bush in 1990. Let us use the debt ceiling vote as leverage.

I would ask everybody to attend the Joint Committee on Policy meeting tomorrow at 10 a.m.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WORLD CHAMPION ATLANTA BRAVES

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on Saturday night in Atlanta, Justice was served—served a high fastball he parked in the right field seats.

That was all the help Tom Glavine would need. With one of the greatest pitching performances of all time, the Atlanta Braves won the World Series—they are world champions.

Since day one, the Braves were on a mission—a quest. They dug deep within

themselves to find the courage, the raw courage, to win the NL East—to beat the Rockies, the Reds, and, finally, the Cleveland Indians—the second best team in baseball.

The old saying—great pitching beats great hitting—held true. The Braves' pitchers were too much for the Indians. But another old saying did not hold true. Nice guys do not always finish last. Congratulations to the World Champion Atlanta Braves. Go Braves, go Braves, go Braves.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REINFORCE OUR COMMON BOND

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Madam Speaker, yesterday we almost witnessed the divorce of a nation. Our great friend and neighbor to the north, Canada, just narrowly avoided splitting in two over linguistic and cultural differences. Canada may yet split up, and linguistic tensions there were not erased by the razor-thin victory of unity yesterday.

Canada's example is a cautionary tale for the United States. We are the most diverse nation in the world. We have over 190 languages here. They have only two.

Within 5 years, one out of every seven Americans will not speak English. We have to make English our official language so we can keep that commonality, so we can keep one Nation, one language, one people. It is important, as important as never before.

So I am asking the Members here to sign onto the bill, H.R. 739, so we can keep our commonality. I have introduced this legislation that seeks to reinforce the common bond that holds our country together, the English language.

We encourage people to study other languages and speak another language at home, but when you vote, when you work with the Government, it has to be done in the English language so we can keep that commonality.

TAXPAYER-FUNDED POLITICAL ADVOCACY

(Mr. LARGENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARGENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support a much needed lobbying reform measure which would put an end to what has come to be known in Washington as Welfare for Lobbyists. I am quite certain that if taxpayers knew that their hard earned money is being spent to subsidize the political activity of certain Federal grant recipients, they would be as outraged as I am over this practice.

As Members of Congress, we have been entrusted by the citizens of this country to oversee how Federal tax dollars are spent. If we continue to allow the incestuous practice of taxpayer-subsidized political activity, we will have betrayed this trust.

We are in the middle of a budget battle. We are trying to reign in wasteful Government spending in the name of fiscal responsibility. How can we face our constituents and say that we have met that responsibility, if we continue to line the pockets of lobbyists with 39 billion dollars' worth of public money?

These lobbyists are exploiting their status as nonprofit grant recipients. The time has come to say "no more." Too many groups have spent too much money to promote the narrow self-interests of too few. Say "no" to this outrage by voting "yes" to the Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich amendment. Vote to end Welfare for Lobbyists.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2492, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 239 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 239

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 239 is a closed rule, which is entirely appropriate in this circumstance in order to provide for the timely consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill. The President vetoed the conference report on this bill on October 3, after it had easily passed both the House and Senate, and in his veto message, claimed he had no problem with the bill's content, merely its timing. Therefore, we do not need to relive the amending

process, and rather than going through the process of a veto override attempt, we should pass this bill quickly so that we can move on to the remaining spending bills.

The rule provides for consideration of the bill in the House, with 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Also, the rule provides one motion to recommit.

House Resolution 239 brings to the floor H.R. 2492, which is identical to the conference report on H.R. 1854, which passed the House on September 6 by an overwhelming vote of 305 to 101. This bill has strong bipartisan support, and even the President described the bill in his veto message as "A disciplined bill, one that I would sign under different circumstances." The House will have shortly completed action on all the spending bills, and the President has now signed both the military construction and agriculture appropriations measures. When H.R. 2492 reaches the President's desk, hopefully the President will also sign this bill, this time.

One issue that arose at the Rules Committee has been debated in many settings, including during debate on the rule on the Transportation appropriations conference report last week—gift ban legislation. Many of us would like to see action on this issue as soon as possible, and in case any of you missed the announcement by the majority leader last week, our leadership is planning to have a lobbying reform bill and tough new gift restrictions on the House floor by November 16. According to the majority leader, the Senate language will serve as the starting point, and later this week, we will be holding a hearing at Rules on the issue. Many Members would like the opportunity to improve on the Senate language, and therefore merely attaching the Senate bill to an appropriations measure in the House is not the way to proceed now that we have a commitment to move gift reform as a separate piece of legislation. Although it was argued that the legislative branch appropriations bill was "an appropriate vehicle," it is nonetheless not germane to attach the Senate gift ban to this bill. Let's give the topic of gift reform the opportunity to be fully debated in the context of its own legislation.

As a Member of Congress who serves on both of the Speaker-appointed committees, and in my role on the Committee on House Oversight, I am very proud of the reforms achieved in the legislative branch appropriations bill, based on the recommendations by House Oversight. We had some tough choices to make, but getting our own House in order and cutting our own budget was a necessary and important first step in the long and difficult road toward achieving a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall from the House's consideration of this bill in June, and again in September, H.R. 2492 incorporates House oversight plans to greatly reform the internal workings of the House of Representatives. This bill is below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation and is over 8 percent below last year's spending level. Additionally, H.R. 2492 consolidates offices and paves the way for the privatization of some functions that may be less costly when performed by the private sector.

I would like to commend Chairman THOMAS, Chairman PACKARD, ranking member FAZIO, and of course Chairman LIVINGSTON, for their excellent work in bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 239 is necessary to preserve the agreements reached in conference, and agreed to in the House and Senate, on legislative branch appropriations. I urge adoption of both the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2492. I oppose this rule for one simple reason: The Republican majority has again denied the House the opportunity to use this bill as the vehicle to finally consider and pass real congressional reform.

The Republican majority has spent the last 10 months talking about the reforms the American people voted for last November. But talk is all we have gotten when it comes to enacting a gift ban and reforming lobby laws. I must ask, Mr. Speaker, is the Republican party all talk and no action? The majority leader has time and again promised action on these issues, but time and again the Republican majority has denied the full House the opportunity to take a vote on what the Republicans claim they were elected and sent to Washington to do.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], has stated her intention to introduce new gift ban and lobby reform legislation and our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], has stated his intention to hold hearings on this matter. But, I must again ask why do we need to keep on talking about this issue when the opportunity to take action is right here and right now. Because this rule will not allow the House to consider this issue today that I will oppose ordering the previous question on this resolution and will seek to amend the rule to permit the House to consider gift ban and lobby reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard many promises from the Republican leadership that this important reform will be considered by November 16. But Mr.

Speaker, since January promises have been made only to be broken. I do not question the sincerity of the pledges made by my chairman or my Rules Committee colleague, but again, I must ask why wait when we can act right now?

Mr. Speaker, when the Rules Committee considered this rule 2 weeks ago, I offered an amendment to the rule proposed by the Republican majority. My amendment would have allowed for the consideration of the gift ban and lobby reform legislation sponsored by my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT]. At that meeting—2 weeks ago Mr. Speaker—the Republican majority stated that the legislative branch appropriations bill was not the proper vehicle to consider such legislation. And even if it were, the legislation introduced by Mr. BRYANT was in need of improvement. And so, instead of allowing the House the opportunity to make the so-called needed improvements to the Bryant proposal, much less consider it at all, the Republican majority proceeded to vote on a strict party line vote against my amendment to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the Republican majority were so dedicated to the principle of reforming the House, then any bill would be the appropriate vehicle to carry such important reforms. And, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. BRYANT's legislation is so flawed why then should we not bring the original proposal of Mrs. WALDHOLTZ to the floor and amend that proposal as needed? And, in addition to the Waldholtz proposal, why not consider the lobby reform proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE], whose bill has nine Republican cosponsors? Why not, Mr. Speaker?

Since the Speaker's Task Force on Reform has not consulted with the Democratic members of the Rules Committee, we can only speculate about which amendments may be considered necessary to improve the Bryant proposal. I have read in the newspaper that the majority leader is considering rethinking the provision of the Senate-passed gift-ban relating to Members' attendance at charity golf, skiing, and tennis tournaments. Does the Republican majority believe that allowing Members to attend these events for free is a significant improvement on a ban on the acceptance of gifts from those who lobby Congress and seek to influence the legislative process?

I have also read that the majority leader thinks the lobby reform legislation might also be the appropriate vehicle to attach a ban on lobbying by nonprofit groups—such as the American Red Cross or the YWCA—who receive Federal grants. Mr. Speaker, as the majority leader well knows, attaching that issue to this legislation is a sure way to guarantee that nothing is

done this year and probably next year. And, Mr. Speaker, what kind of reform is it that allows Members to play golf with lobbyists at exclusive country clubs while at the same time prohibiting the Red Cross from lobbying in our offices?

And so, in order to allow the House to consider proposals adopted by the Senate last summer, it is my intention to offer an amendment to this rule which would allow the House to consider the Waldholtz and McHale proposals along with the legislative branch appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is being used as a convenient way to avoid directly addressing an issue that truly does resonate outside the beltway. Briefings and hearings in the Rules Committee really don't mean much to my constituents. Many of them pay very close attention to the United We Stand movement and support for this issue is considered to be a paramount test of an incumbent's willingness to truly reform the Congress. And, I suspect, on this issue, actions will indeed speak louder than briefings and hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly offered amendments in the Rules Committee which would, had they been adopted by the Republican majority, afforded the House the opportunity to vote on the gift ban and lobby reform legislation. It is time to stop talking about reform and to start enacting reform. I would urge my colleagues to vote for real congressional reform and to defeat the previous question in order that this rule can be amended to allow the consideration of gift ban-lobby reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the gentleman from Texas is not opposed to this bill. It is obvious that his only intent in opposing the rule is that it does not permit for a debate on a totally separate and independent issue. The majority leader has made a very clear and succinct promise that the gift ban issue will be brought up within the next couple of weeks, and I think that that is what we fully intend to do.

There is no question that the gift ban needs to be debated at length and in detail on the floor of the House, and it will be. But an hour's debate on a bill that is totally unrelated to it is not the best time nor the place to do it.

I am convinced that the 2 weeks is not going to do harm to the issue. The President has indicated that this is a good bill. This is a good rule. It permits us to readdress the bill that he vetoed for extraneous reasons, totally unrelated to the merits of the bill. Thus,

the appropriate thing is for us to pass this rule, to debate the bill, to pass the bill, send it to the President, along with several other appropriations bills, and then debate the gift ban issue at the appropriate time and with the appropriate amount of time to do it properly.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] surely would not wish for us to limit the debate on the gift ban to 1 hour. It deserves more than that. It is not without controversy, and certainly what would be the time to do it, when we have time.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to limit the debate to an hour on very many issues, but I would point out to the gentleman, we passed this bill by an overwhelming margin in the House last year. It passed by an overwhelming margin when it was a conference committee report. It would be the law today, but for the fact it was filibustered by the Republicans in the Senate at the end of the last session. We are only asking that we take up what has been adopted and passed by the Senate.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman will get exactly what he is asking for, but not on this bill. It will come up within the 2 week period that has been promised. I am convinced it will happen. Then the gentleman will have an opportunity to debate it in far greater detail than as a rider on a totally unrelated bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first say that the observations and exchange of just a moment ago with regard to the possibility that this matter may be brought up in the future should cause every Member to ask why we are moving as we are moving today. I think it has been answered in part already by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] who pointed out that this promise has been made over and over and over, and now the entire year has nearly gone by here, and still nothing has been done with regard to limiting the ability of a Member of Congress to take free tickets, free golf, free travel, free recreational travel in the guise of charitable tournaments and so forth, from lobbyists, whose job is to influence our decisions on matters that affect the American public.

It has been promised over and over, but it has not happened. Worse, in the press conference that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority

leader, had last week, he suggested that maybe we need to make some alterations in the Senate rules. Now, the Senate already has these rulings in effect in the Senate. Maybe we ought to alter them if we are going to make them apply to the House, so we can allow more of these charitable golf tournaments.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the American people do not want that kind of alteration. If we are delaying taking this up so that we can drag this whole matter back through a bunch of hearings, hash it over again and again, when it has passed the House twice last year, and it is now the rules in the Senate, just to delay it so a few Members can continue to play free golf and take advantage of their job and embarrass all the rest of the House of Representatives by showing up on the television magazine shows, then my answer is, we ought to go ahead and act today.

Let me mention the activities of one Member of the House. I will not call his name, but I am reading from his financial disclosure statement. This is 1988. This Member played in the Bob Hope Charity Classic, where he got \$350 in golf clothing and accessories, by the way, as a little bonus for playing. In the Kemper Open Golf Tournament, the Houston Golf Association Golf Tournament, the Danny Thomas Memorial Golf Tournament, the Larry Bird Charity Golf Tournament. In all of these he got between \$150 and \$300 in gifts at the same time.

In 1989 five more golf tournaments, just the same as the ones I just read.

In 1990, he really hit the big time. The Bob Hope, the Kemper, the Youthlinks, the Mazda, the Danny Thomas, the GTE, the ACLI Golf Tournament. Big bags of gifts all the way.

In 1991, he kept on going to these golf tournaments, and so on and so forth.

I just submit, there is a question about if this guy has too much free time. I mean, playing golf every single weekend someplace, a fancy golf tournament, getting a bag of free gifts, no wonder he comes down to the floor and hollars and hoots and says we ought not to pass any gift legislation.

I just submit, this is a grotesque embarrassment to the House of Representatives. We ought to end it right now. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has said we are going to do is attempt to defeat the previous question on this rule so that we can bring up the Senate gift bill, which has been introduced here by me, but also been introduced by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

□ 1045

We are going to bring up the gentlewoman from Utah, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ's, version of the Senate gift bill which is in effect in the Senate now. It has 17 Republican cosponsors. And we will bring up the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania, Mr. McHALE's, lobby reform bill, which has 9 Republican cosponsors.

If the previous question is defeated, we will take this up immediately and we will pass it and we will be through with this interminable argument, and we will be able to guarantee to the American people that the next 2 weeks, before this, I do not know, third, or fourth or fifth time the Majority Leader has offered us a deadline for voting, that in the next 2 weeks we will not spend our time trying to find a way to water down a common-sense set of regulations with regard to the ability of a Member of the House of Representatives to take free gifts and free golf and free food and free everything else from the very lobbyists that are hired to influence us in making decisions.

Mr. Speaker, it is a common-sense strategy. I submit that if we, and I am speaking to the Members of the House, do not want to see more of these magazine shows where a few Members of the House are pictured running all over the place in golf carts, on beaches, and everywhere else, getting freebies from lobbyists, then for goodness sakes vote down the previous question and let us pass this thing and be done with it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a discussion here about whether or not they want to change, the Republicans want to change the gift rule to allow for charity golf outings. I think the list that the gentleman just read makes a point here that, in each of these instances, these are sponsored by corporate entities that have business before the Congress of the United States. Most Members of Congress that play in a charity golf tournament of that nature could not name the charity that is the beneficiary or the charities that are the beneficiaries. What they know is they got there because Kemper invited them or some insurance association invited them, not because the charity invited them.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his additions to my remarks.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are at this time facing before us the rule for the legislative branch appropriations bill. Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader committed to having votes in the House on both the lobbying bill and the gift reform rule on or before November 16. Yesterday my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], introduced House Resolution 250, which is identical to the Senate rule.

Today, the chairman of the Committee on Rules announced the first hear-

ing on this resolution at 10 a.m. this Thursday. We then intend to hold another hearing next week to report the resolution. Mr. Speaker, The Committee on the Judiciary is proceeding to report the lobby reform bill in time to meet the deadline set by the Majority Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I see other distinguished colleagues here. For example, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. He was before us in the Committee on Rules. He pointed out that this product before us is the work of much bipartisan effort. The President, at the time he vetoed it, as I stated before, stated he vetoed it not for substantive reasons but for reasons of timing. And after that our friends on the other side of the aisle have reiterated that this precisely is a bipartisan product that has achieved consensus.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that the amendment that my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] wishes to offer to this rule is nongermane to the rule and would be held out of order even if the previous question is defeated. So this, Mr. Speaker, is, in fact, a nongermane exercise that we are facing now on a nongermane amendment to the rule to make in order a nongermane amendment to the bill.

It may be difficult for some of our friends on the other side of the aisle to realize that we are facing before us the rule on legislative appropriations, but that is what we are facing at this time and that is what the House should pass this morning, the rule and, subsequently, the bill on legislative branch appropriations.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the only reason it is nongermane is because the Committee on Rules refuses to make it germane.

As far as lobby reform is concerned, I am sure Members have seen today's history of bills and resolutions and realized an indication of Speaker GINGRICH's commitment to reform is the fact that the lobby reform bill came onto his desk on July the 26 and sat there for three months, over three months, until yesterday afternoon before he even bothered to refer it to committee. That is hardly an indication of any commitment to clean this place up, is it?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what I am trying to do, and obviously I am trying to remain as civil as I think the House deserves at this point on this issue and also as much as I can on the subject that we are debating, the fact is that we have a rule with a framework, providing a framework for debate for a conference committee report on the funding of the legislative branch. I am

not getting into issues with regard to the fact that friends on the other side of the aisle had 40 years here to make these changes, and I am not going to get into that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Because Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that last year twice the House approved the gift ban.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded the gentleman time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. So, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting on, continuing on nonrelevant issues, I am trying to focus the attention of the House on what is before us, which is the rule setting the guideline for debate for a conference committee report to fund the legislative branch.

That is what is before us, Mr. Speaker; and I would hope that after having seen the commitment of the leadership of this House to bring forth before us this issue that has been brought out this morning, before November 19 to the floor, that there is a limit to which this exercise that our friends on the other side of the aisle are engaging in can remain useful even for them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would point out to my friend from Florida that we brought this very issue up the first day of the legislative session in January. We have brought it up repeatedly. Every time we have attempted to get a vote on this issue we have been prevented from having that vote by the Republican majority, and we will continue to bring this issue up at every opportunity until, finally, it gets to the floor.

The Republican majority has said, "Oh, trust us, it will come up no later than November 16." Well, lo and behold, we will come to November 16 and there may just be another reason why it cannot be voted on at that time.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to raise this issue at every appropriate juncture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking Democratic Member on the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will comment on the substance of the legislative branch bill later on, but I do want to support his effort on this rule to bring lobby and gift reform before this Congress today. I think it is worthwhile, particularly in light of the comments of the gentleman from Florida to review what, in fact, has transpired in this Congress.

In 1989, we passed one of the most fundamental reforms of our ethics laws in the modern history of the Congress. President Bush signed it with great

fanfare. But in the last Congress we have attempted to conform some of the more stringent provisions that we put in place for executive branch personnel with the Congress of the United States.

The lobby reform bill we considered in the last Congress was passed through the Senate by a 95 to 2 vote. We then took it up on the floor of this House on suspension and passed it 315 to 110 in the last Congress. Then, despite some smoke screen opposition which we have even attempted to deal with this year in this bill, we were able to pass it once again as a conference report, 306 to 112.

We went to the Senate and, lo and behold, the Senate filibustered. The Republican Members of that body, not wanting to grant the Democrats a political victory on the eve of an election, prevented this legislation from going forward to the White House for a certain signature.

So here we are in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, with those same Republicans now in charge for 10 full months and how have we advanced lobby and gift reform? Certainly not in a bipartisan way in this body. The other body passed it, sent it over here unanimously.

As has already been indicated by my friend from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] the Speaker did not refer it to committee. He held it from July to the present time at the desk. No discharge petition could even be filed because the bill was not before the committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] in his subcommittee had a hearing on lobby reform, but, obviously, no markup was scheduled. No bill was really before them.

Leadership, as exemplified by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] last Friday, has only materialized since this Democratic caucus went on the offensive, adopting a resolution strongly supporting gift and lobby reform, and relentlessly bringing this issue to the floor.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we act in a bipartisan manner by in effect discharging, if possible, the Waldholtz and McHale bills. This is not an effort to push a partisan agenda. We are bringing the bipartisan freshman and sophomore classes together and letting their legislation come before us, if this rule could be amended to bring that about.

So just when lobby and gift reform was likely to pass last week, this bill was pulled from the floor. The legislative branch bill, which was scheduled, was removed from the agenda.

The comments of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] which were designed to really calm us down and indicate to us that we would be dealing with this issue in the future, in my mind create more questions and doubts than they resolve.

First of all, instead of going to the Ethics Committee, the Committee on

Standards of Official Conduct, a bipartisan committee where we could have dealt with this issue of gift rules where we historically have judged gift rules, we are going to the partisan Committee on Rules.

Instead of simply passing the Senate version of the gift rule ban, we are now holding up the specter of the golf trips and the various methods by which people get to engage in travel for fun, when, in fact, the charity is only marginally involved in the process.

We also have heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] refer to a task force, not a committee that will meet in public and debate these issues, but a task force, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] will chair which will have jurisdiction. Mr. HOEKSTRA having just been removed from the Committee on the Budget to accommodate another problem on the minority side will apparently guide us. That task force, not in the daylight of public scrutiny apparently, will then take up the question of lobby and gift reform.

Well, it seems to me we have already understood that it is time to move forward on lobby reform. Now we hear that perhaps the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] wants to inject the poison pill of the Istook amendment into the lobby reform bill, a proposal which Senator HATFIELD and Members of the Senate Republican majority find unacceptable, certainly on all the appropriations bills that have been considered in the other body.

So that very contentious and difficult issue that bans nonprofit agencies from lobbying is going to be injected into the debate on the question of whether we should pass a simple statute to bring thousands of lobbyists, who don't report on their involvement in the legislative process under current law, into the light of day, requiring them to indicate to the public just who they are representing, how much money they are spending, et cetera.

The Arme approach to lobby and gift reform, it seems to me, is likely to be a disaster. It is likely to slow down this process and make all of the efforts we have been making on this side of the aisle a real waste of all our time. We ought not separate these bills and we ought not amend them. Pass the Senate bills.

I hope the leadership, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], will relent and allow us to move forward on the Waldholtz and McHale legislation today. I fear we will regret it when we fail to join the Senate in passing gift and lobby reform by the end of this year.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I know it is hard to get to the debate on the relevant issue, but I yield at this time such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1100

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and valued Rules Committee colleague from Miami, FL, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I could not in good conscience remain silent on why we are here today on a bill that is identical to one that was overwhelmingly adopted by both Houses and which the President himself has indicated is a good and disciplined bill that he would sign under different circumstances.

We are here because the President nevertheless vetoed the bill that is \$206 million or 8.6 percent below last year's spending level.

What were the so-called circumstances that prompted this veto at the same time he signed the military construction appropriations bill? Well, he just didn't think it was right for us to pass our own appropriations bill before all the others were finished.

Mr. Speaker, that argument might hold some water if other Presidents had taken the same position in the past, or, if the Congress had traditionally waited until last to pass the legislative branch appropriations bill. But that is just not the case.

We have traditionally acted early on the legislative branch bills under Democratic controlled Congresses. And Republican Presidents have traditionally signed them.

It is one thing for a nonincumbent presidential candidate to run against Congress. But it is quite another for a sitting President to use the veto pen for political, rather than fiscal, purposes. To me this is a gross breach of comity between the two branches, with no apparent rationale whatsoever beyond rhetorical politics.

It would be one thing if the President had vetoed this bill because it spent more than last year on Congress, or did not cut our spending as much as we have for the other departments of Government. But even if that were the case, which it is not, those criteria were not used by previous Republican presidents when Democrats ran Congress.

So it is truly regrettable that we must pass this same bill again and hope that this time the so-called circumstances are right—that all the planets are now in proper alignment with each other.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend again the chairman and ranking minority member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, Mr. PACKARD and Mr. FAZIO, for all the work they have done on this legislation. They have helped this House keep its word to the American people that we would lead the way by making an example of ourselves in reducing spending and staff before asking others to do so. We have kept that commitment. Fiscal restraint and discipline should not be made a punishable act by the President.

With respect to this rule, I regret that a nongermane amendment is being interjected into the previous question vote on a bill that has such overwhelming support. The gentleman from Texas has described the germaneness problem with his amendment on lobbying and gift reform as merely technical. That is a gross understatement, to put it as kindly as I can.

The amendment he wishes to offer if the previous question is defeated has nothing to do with legislative branch appropriations, nor is it even remotely close to any jurisdiction that the Appropriations Committee enjoys.

The amendment falls directly under the jurisdiction of two completely different committees—Judiciary and Standards of Official Conduct.

So, once again we are being asked to go through a futile exercise and a meaningless vote since the amendment to the rule itself would be nongermane to the rule, and the parliamentarians have confirmed that it would be ruled out of order on a point of order.

So why is the minority intent on taking us down this blind alley? Presumably it is being done to send a message. But, the majority leader announced just last Friday that we will vote on the gift rule on or before November 16. And we are proceeding in the Rules Committee which I chair to hold hearings and then report the gift rule.

There is no longer a need to send a message. We had long ago committed to acting on this. It was only a question of when. And now we know.

Mr. Speaker, the previous question vote is not only a futile exercise and futile vote on a blatantly nongermane amendment to this rule; it is an attempt to politicize and polarize on an issue that is broadly bipartisan. Don't be hoodwinked, by these political shenanigans, into thinking that it is anything else.

Vote "yes" on the previous question, vote "yes" on this rule, and vote "yes" on this bill that keeps our commitment to downsizing the Congress.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE].

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], a moment ago. He correctly pointed out that a third of the employees of the House had been let go as a cost savings measure.

I would point out to the gentleman I put a bill in that would reduce the size of the House of Representatives by one-third, and perhaps he would like to join me in that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in my view the reform of the House of Representatives ought not to be a partisan issue. On the very first day of this session I was pleased to stand at this microphone and join with my colleague the gentleman from

Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], as we fought in a bipartisan manner for the passage and ultimately the enactment of the Congressional Accountability Act, repealing the exemptions that Members of Congress had given themselves going back almost six decades of American history.

Similarly I was pleased to support the honorable and I think farsighted effort of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], in her effort to bring to the floor a bill that would for the first time really enact meaningful gift ban legislation.

But today, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to stand with my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] as we attempt to move forward the issue of lobbying disclosure reform.

If we defeat the previous question, we will have the opportunity to attach to this bill language previously passed in the United States Senate on the vitally important issue of lobbying disclosure.

Let me take a moment, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to point out exactly what it is we are trying to pass today. H.R. 2268, which would be attached to this bill, clearly defines a lobbyist as anyone who spends at least 20 percent of his time lobbying Members of Congress, congressional staffs, Presidential and other political appointees in the executive branch on any topic or any executive branch official on congressional issues. Registration requirements would apply to those lobbyists who receive at least \$5,000 from any client in a 6-month period and those companies that use in-house lobbyists and spend at least \$20,000 in a 6-month period of time on lobbying activities. Lobbyists will register semiannually with the Clerk of the House, the Secretary of the Senate, and violations of the law will be referred to the U.S. attorney who can seek fines up to \$50,000.

Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker. The vote that we will take in the next few minutes is a litmus test for reformers. Those who are satisfied with the current deficient law will vote for the previous question. Those of us who believe in a bipartisan manner that you can vote twice for a good piece of legislation, you can today defeat the previous question and on or after November 16 support any additional legislation that might be brought to the floor, will vote "no."

Today we have an opportunity to make a difference. Just as the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] made a difference in January, just as the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is attempting to move forward the issue of gift ban legislation, today, Mr. Speaker, we can vote "no" on the previous question and guarantee that those paid professional lobbyists, who on a daily basis attempt to influence the content of legislation, will

continue to pursue their advocacy but will reveal that advocacy and its cost to the American people.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for yielding me this time and I commend him for his persistence in bringing this good, fiscally responsible bill to the floor for a second time. We are here today, doing *deja-vu* all over again, because the President apparently chose to use this bill as a soapbox upon which to seek political points rather than exercising sound leadership on matters of fiscal responsibility.

The President vetoed this bill not because he opposed it—he did not. In fact, the President said he would sign the exact same bill—some other time. And so, we will send him the exact same bill, with a new number on it and on a different day, with the hope that the political winds blow in the right direction this time around.

Mr. Speaker, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle have assured us that they do not agree with the President's decision to veto the legislative branch funding bill. Nonetheless, judging by our Rules Committee meeting and floor tactics since then, some of our Democrat colleagues have appeared somewhat gleeful at the opportunity to re-run the debate on lobby and gift reform. Those matters are very important—and in fact, will be on this floor for debate and vote on or before November 16, that is, in a few short weeks. This was the commitment given on Friday by our majority leader, and I have every confidence that commitment will be met.

Mr. ARMEY has tasked our Rules Committee with reviewing the gift rules adopted in the other body, with an eye to strengthening and improving them. And our Rules Committee has plans to move forward this week and next in completing that assignment.

As a member of both committees with jurisdiction over gift reform—that is, the Ethics Committee and the Rules Committee—I am keenly interested in tightening up our rules to improve our credibility with the American people and to better ensure transparency and fair play inside the beltway.

In my office, we accept no gifts and no travel, regardless of who pays for it, not because we can be bought, but because the gray areas involving gifts do cause concern among the people I represent. In fact, I believe that most Members are seeking greater clarity and guidance than currently exist in our rules on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, given the commitment we have received from our leadership, this attempt to attach a non-germane

item to the legislative branch funding bill—which has no bearing on House rules—appears a bit mischievous, designed perhaps to score a few political points. I hope Members recognize the tremendous changes that are being implemented by this new majority—and gift reform will be among them by the time the record books of the 1st session of the 104th Congress are written.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I take the gentleman at his word. I am sure he has his own standards in his office as I do. I think we both could agree, though, that the fastest way and the fairest way to accomplish our mutual goals of upgrading the standards we all have to live by would be to take the two pieces of legislation that passed through the Senate and send them on to the President without getting into the complexity of amendments, which I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] referred to in his comments the other day which have the effect of only impeding our progress and perhaps weakening the oil.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming the time, I would simply say to the distinguished gentleman that we are reviewing that very possibility among other possibilities. We want to get a better outcome than the Senate has had. I like what the Senate has done. I do not think it is enough. I happen to have more stringent rules in my own office. I think many of us do. In the meantime, any Member who is concerned on this subject, of course, has the opportunity to self-exercise his or her own rules as long as they are more stringent than the rules of the House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, pass the gift ban and lobbying reform.

In a spectacular display of re-writing history, Speaker GINGRICH claimed that "when the Democrats controlled Congress, every effort at political reform failed."

But last Congress, the Democratic House passed lobbying and gift ban reform. The bill was killed by two Republican filibusters in the Senate.

And, according to Congressional Quarterly, it was NEWT GINGRICH himself who blocked these reforms in the House.

Now that they are in the majority, it seems they like their perks, loopholes, and cushy lobbyist ties too much to give them up.

Back in January, Speaker GINGRICH called Democratic attempts to ban gifts pathetically partisan. Ten months later he is still stonewalling. Even the Senate has unanimously passed both lobby disclosure and the gift ban—4 months ago!

No more excuses. No more delays. Defeat this rule. Pass lobbying disclosure and a gift ban now.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. Congress must begin to restore the credibility to this institution by passing strong measures to ban gifts to Members of Congress and staff and to prevent undue influence by special interest lobbyists.

Four times this session Democrats have tried to pass gift ban and lobby reform legislation. We have tried to force vote after vote to do what is right. It seems that we are dragging our Republican colleagues kicking and screaming toward these reforms that are needed to restore the integrity of this Congress.

In fact, Republicans pulled a bill from the floor last week that would have banned gifts and would have forced lobbyists to disclose their sources of income. What are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle afraid of?

The Republicans said that they would schedule a vote sometime in the future on these important issues. But why wait? Let us start today. Let us pass the gift ban and lobby reform bills that have been passed by the Senate, get them to the President for his signature, and send a message to the American people that we listened to their call for honest and open Government.

The Republican leadership is stalling and plans to water down the legislation. We have already heard talk of continuing the all-expense-paid Government vacation for Members of Congress. A bill that protects these perks, the golf players' perks, is a hole-in-one for the lobbyists and a double bogey for the American public.

Let us pass a tough gift-ban bill and lobby-reform bill, and let us do it today. Let us not wait for some God-forsaken day or some middle-of-the-night event where nothing will happen. Let us get rid of the golf perks in this body.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has never played golf and really has no intention of ever doing so, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], a distinguished member of this House who has worked tirelessly since arriving here for genuine reform, and not political posturing.

□ 1115

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in the Committee on Rules trying to do my duty, attending my committee meeting, when my ears started burning. I understand my name was made reference to a number of times during the debate, at least the bill I have sponsored.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we talk candidly about the political theater that is going on the floor this morning. For 40 years the

other party has been in charge of this House. For 40 years they had the ability to set the standards of conduct in this Congress. For 40 years they resisted efforts to make substantive change that this Congress made on the first day that we were sworn in.

Mr. Speaker, the first day this Congress was sworn in we did away with proxy voting so that we all actually have to go and in person cast our votes in committee instead of handing them by proxy to someone else who can vote for us while we ignore our committee responsibilities. The first day this Congress was sworn in, Mr. Speaker, we cut committee staffs by a third. We limited the terms of committee chairmen so the fiefdoms that had grown up in this Congress, giving extraordinary power to a select few, all of the opposition party, was broken up, again, Mr. Speaker, for the first time certainly since the other side had controlled this Congress for 40 years. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, the first day this Congress was sworn in we passed an act that will make this Congress have to live by the same employment laws that it passes for the rest of the country, the Shays Act, the Congressional Accountability Act.

Mr. Speaker, those are extraordinary reforms that the other side could have done when they were in control and chose not to. Mr. Speaker, we are not done with the reform process. We had a few intervening items of business to take care of, like balancing the budget of the United States in 7 years, like reforming the Medicare System so it would actually be here in 7 years instead of allowing it to go into bankruptcy which would have happened undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, without the action of this House over the last several months. And, Mr. Speaker, we had to take care of those items.

I would have preferred that we would have dealt with gift ban and lobbying reform earlier, but we had important work to do. We did it. And the very next day after passing the 7-year plan to balance the budget of this Nation, the leadership of the Republican Party stepped forward to announce a date certain, not some date off in the future, a date certain we will vote on gift ban and lobbying reform, on or before November 16. Why are we waiting until then, Mr. Speaker? To allow the Members of this body to make whatever suggestions they think are necessary to improve upon the work of the Senate.

There have been statements made that it is a mistake to change what the Senate did, because it will have to go back to the Senate for revoting. That is true on lobbying reform. I do not think that is the case or that is a case to be made for not improving a bill if we think it can be improved, and if we can improve the lobbying bill, we should do so and send it back to the

Senate and invite our colleagues in the other body to join with us in improving that legislation.

But, and this is critical, Mr. Speaker, the gift-ban legislation that I have proposed is a change to the rules of the House of Representatives. It does not require the assent of the Senate. It does not require the approval of the President. Whatever we decide as a body to do with respect to improving and tightening the rules with respect to gift-ban legislation we can pass in this House and make effective without any action by anybody else.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we allow the Members of this body the opportunity to step forward with ideas that they have to improve this legislation, because as I said last week, Mr. Speaker, I am not so vain as to believe that any bill is perfect simply because it has my name as the sponsor on it, and I am eager to listen to the ideas of my colleagues and how they think this bill can be improved. Let me just make reference, Mr. Speaker, to what happened most recently the last time this House took up gift-ban legislation. Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan task force on reform in 1989, gave us the current gift ban or gift rule that is in effect. At that time they raised gifts, the level for exempt gifts, from \$35 to \$75, plus they added a measure to account for inflation. That is what the opposition gave us when they took up this legislation when they were in control of this body.

Now why did they kick it up so high? Well, at the time the floor debate was that it was because of inflation. We were told at that time on the floor the debate was centered on the fact it was to account for inflation. I understand the word, Member-to-Member, was passed at the time it was because of greens fees. Mr. Speaker, I do not golf. I do not like golf. But if I decided to take up the hobby, I certainly intend to pay for it myself.

This gift-ban legislation is good, strong legislation. This body deserves the opportunity to have hearings on it, to bring it to the floor for discussion, and then to have a vote.

I am proud to support my leadership who have made the commitment to voting on these very critical issues on or before November 16. That is how the legislative process should work, Mr. Speaker. What we are seeing today is political theater, and the American people should not be fooled.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I would just like to ask the gentlewoman if she is aware the coalition you are a member of, testified before the Constitutional Law Subcommittee 2 months ago, we ought not to deal with any amendments, we ought to take the Senate

rules up, which is what I introduced and you introduced, immediately.

My question is, You now want to entertain the possibility people can come forward and weaken Senate rules so Members can play free golf, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] suggested might be in order?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I was at the press conference. I will simply say the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] did not suggest free golf was in order. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is we should respect the opportunity that has been established through the committee structure of this House to allow Members the opportunity. This body deserves the opportunity to follow the committee structure for hearings and amendment and debate, and I believe these bills will be strengthened, if changed, not weakened.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I would only point out to the gentlewoman that in 1989 the bipartisan committee that handled these matters was exactly evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans. The Vice Chair was the gentlewoman from Illinois. Mrs. Martin. The reforms of 1989 were done on a bipartisan basis which she decries now.

The only other point I would make is we have a situation that this is manana, manana, always the next day, always the next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, before us today is not political theater, as the gentlewoman suggested, but a clear opportunity to vote for gift and lobbying disclosure reform that is exactly like the Senate so it will be passed and sign into law.

Let me first stress that this has been a bipartisan fight. There are many Republicans like the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] who have courageously taken on their own leadership to convince them to do the right thing, and the right thing is to take these relatively small steps forward to clean our own House.

It has been 142 days since the Speaker shook hands with the President in New Hampshire and pledged to act on lobbying reform and campaign finance reform. I cannot understand why the Republican leadership, which took only 100 days to pass the Contract With America, has waited 142 days and still has not fulfilled the commitment of the Speaker's handshake.

Mr. Speaker, today it is time to turn the promise of a handshake into the reality of law, and we certainly do not have to wait 16 days until the arbitrary November 16 date of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The proposal before us is not earth-shattering reform. The House has

passed an even tougher reform bill twice in the last Congress, and the package is identical to the legislation overwhelmingly passed by the Senate.

Is it too much to ask Members to pay for meals over \$50?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been at the center of virtually every reform movement that has occurred in this House since the day I got here, limiting outside income, stopping the practicing of law on the side, financial disclosure requirements, you name it. I have done it all, because I believe deeply that this institution cannot afford to be in a situation in which it does not have the absolute faith and confidence of the American people. We simply cannot afford to have the public witness year after year after year television exposés of Members on lobbyists' paid golfing vacations and other trips like that. We have to put an end to that.

This is the right bill to use in order to do just that. I urge you to vote against the rule. I urge you to support the leadership of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and finally end this insider schmoozing which is bringing so much discredit to this institution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will add two new titles to the bill. The first will incorporate the text of H.R. 2268, the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McHALE], and the second one incorporates the text of H.R. 214, the bill offered by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ], relating to gift reform.

I am including the amendment to the rule and the text of the lobbying reform and gift ban proposals at this point in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 239, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. FROST OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, there shall be considered as adopted in the House an amendment adding as new titles at the end of the bill (H.R. 2492) the texts of H. Res. 214 (relating to gift reform) and H.R. 2268 (relating to lobbying disclosure), as introduced in the House on September 6, 1995, but excluding sections 16 through 23 of H.R. 2268.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 239, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA
TITLE IV—GIFT REFORM
AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RULES

SEC. 401. Clause 4 of rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a)(1) No Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall knowingly accept a gift except as provided in this rule.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift (other than cash or cash equivalent) which the Member, officer, or employee reasonably and in good faith believes to have a value of less than \$50, and a cumulative value from one source during a calendar year of less than \$100. No gift with a value below \$10 shall count toward the \$100 annual limit. No formal recordkeeping is required by this paragraph, but a Member, officer, or employee shall make a good faith effort to comply with this paragraph.

"(b)(1) For the purpose of this rule, the term 'gift' means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, or other item having monetary value. The term includes gifts of services, training, transportation, lodging, and meals, whether provided in kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has been incurred.

"(2)(A) A gift to a family member of a Member, officer, or employee, or a gift to any other individual based on that individual's relationship with the Member, officer, or employee, shall be considered a gift to the Member, officer, or employee if it is given with the knowledge and acquiescence of the Member, officer, or employee and the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was given because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(B) If food or refreshment is provided at the same time and place to both a Member, officer, or employee and the spouse or dependent thereof, only the food or refreshment provided to the Member, officer, or employee shall be treated as a gift for purposes of this rule.

"(c) The restrictions in subparagraph (a) shall not apply to the following:

"(1) Anything for which the Member, officer, or employee pays the market value, or does not use and promptly returns to the donor.

"(2) A contribution, as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(3) A gift from a relative as described in section 107(2) of title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-521).

"(4)(A) Anything provided by an individual on the basis of a personal friendship unless the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe that, under the circumstances, the gift was provided because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and not because of the personal friendship.

"(B) In determining whether a gift is provided on the basis of personal friendship, the Member, officer, or employee shall consider the circumstances under which the gift was offered, such as:

"(i) The history of the relationship between the individual giving the gift and the recipient of the gift, including any previous exchange of gifts between such individuals.

"(ii) Whether to the actual knowledge of the Member, officer, or employee the individual who gave the gift personally paid for the gift or sought a tax deduction or business reimbursement for the gift.

"(iii) Whether to the actual knowledge of the Member, officer, or employee the individual who gave the gift also at the same time gave the same or similar gifts to other Members, officers, or employees.

"(5) A contribution or other payment to a legal expense fund established for the benefit

of a Member, officer, or employee, that is otherwise lawfully made, subject to the disclosure requirements of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, except as provided in paragraph 3(c).

"(6) Any gift from another Member, officer, or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

"(7) Food, refreshments, lodging, and other benefits—

"(A) resulting from the outside business or employment activities (or other outside activities that are not connected to the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder) of the Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse of the Member, officer, or employee, if such benefits have not been offered or enhanced because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and are customarily provided to others in similar circumstances;

"(B) customarily provided by a prospective employer in connection with bona fide employment discussions; or

"(C) provided by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in connection with a fundraising or campaign event sponsored by such an organization.

"(8) Pension and other benefits resulting from continued participation in an employee welfare and benefits plan maintained by a former employer.

"(9) Informational materials that are sent to the office of the Member, officer, or employee in the form of books, articles, periodicals, other written materials, audiotapes, videotapes, or other forms of communication.

"(10) Awards or prizes which are given to competitors in contests or events open to the public, including random drawings.

"(11) Honorary degrees (and associated travel, food, refreshments, and entertainment) and other bona fide, nonmonetary awards presented in recognition of public service (and associated food, refreshments, and entertainment provided in the presentation of such degrees and awards).

"(12) Donations of products from the State that the Member represents that are intended primarily for promotional purposes, such as display or free distribution, and are of minimal value to any individual recipient.

"(13) Training (including food and refreshments furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the training) provided to a Member, officer, or employee, if such training is in the interest of the House of Representatives.

"(14) Bequests, inheritances, and other transfers at death.

"(15) Any item, the receipt of which is authorized by the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or any other statute.

"(16) Anything which is paid for by the Federal Government, by a State or local government, or secured by the Government under a Government contract.

"(17) A gift of personal hospitality (as defined in section 109(14) of the Ethics in Government Act) of an individual other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal.

"(18) Free attendance at a widely attended event permitted pursuant to subparagraph (d).

"(19) Opportunities and benefits which are—

"(A) available to the public or to a class consisting of all Federal employees, whether or not restricted on the basis of geographic consideration;

"(B) offered to members of a group or class in which membership is unrelated to congressional employment;

"(C) offered to members of an organization, such as an employees' association or congressional credit union, in which membership is related to congressional employment and similar opportunities are available to large segments of the public through organizations of similar size;

"(D) offered to any group or class that is not defined in a manner that specifically discriminates among Government employees on the basis of branch of Government or type of responsibility, or on a basis that favors those of higher rank or rate of pay;

"(E) in the form of loans from banks and other financial institutions on terms generally available to the public; or

"(F) in the form of reduced membership or other fees for participation in organization activities offered to all Government employees by professional organizations if the only restrictions on membership relate to professional qualifications.

"(20) A plaque, trophy, or other item that is substantially commemorative in nature and which is intended solely for presentation.

"(21) Anything for which, in an unusual case, a waiver is granted by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

"(22) Food or refreshments of a nominal value offered other than as a part of a meal.

"(23) An item of little intrinsic value such as a greeting card, baseball cap, or a T-shirt.

"(d)(1) A Member, officer, or employee may accept an offer of free attendance at a widely attended convention, conference, symposium, forum, panel discussion, dinner, viewing, reception, or similar event, provided by the sponsor of the event, if—

"(A) the Member, officer, or employee participates in the event as a speaker or a panel participant, by presenting information related to Congress or matters before Congress, or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the Member's, officer's, or employee's official position; or

"(B) attendance at the event is appropriate to the performance of the official duties or representative function of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee who attends an event described in clause (1) may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at the event for an accompanying individual if others in attendance will generally be similarly accompanied or if such attendance is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

"(3) A Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse or dependent thereof, may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at a charity event, except that reimbursement for transportation and lodging may not be accepted in connection with an event that does not meet the standards provided in paragraph 2.

"(4) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'free attendance' may include waiver of all or part of a conference or other fee, the provision of local transportation, or the provision of food, refreshments, entertainment, and instructional materials furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the event. The term does not include entertainment collateral to the event, nor does it include food or refreshments taken other than in a group setting with all or substantially all other attendees.

"(e) No Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift the value of which exceeds \$250

on the basis of the personal friendship exception in subparagraph (c)(4) unless the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct issues a written determination that such exception applies. No determination under this subparagraph is required for gifts given on the basis of the family relationship exception.

"(f) When it is not practicable to return a tangible item because it is perishable, the item may, at the discretion of the recipient, be given to an appropriate charity or destroyed.

"(g)(1) A reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, officer, or employee from an individual other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal for necessary transportation, lodging and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip or similar event in connection with the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder shall be deemed to be a reimbursement to the House of Representatives and not a gift prohibited by this rule, if the Member, officer, or employee—

"(A) in the case of an employee, receives advance authorization, from the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works, to accept reimbursement, and

"(B) discloses the expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed and the authorization to the Clerk of the House of Representatives within 30 days after the travel is completed.

"(2) For purposes of clause (1), events, the activities of which are substantially recreational in nature, shall not be considered to be in connection with the duties of a Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder.

"(h) Each advance authorization to accept reimbursement shall be signed by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works and shall include—

"(1) the name of the employee;

"(2) the name of the person who will make the reimbursement;

"(3) the time, place, and purpose of the travel; and

"(4) a determination that the travel is in connection with the duties of the employee as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the employee is using public office for private gain.

"(i) Each disclosure made under subparagraph (g)(1) of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed shall be signed by the Member or officer (in the case of travel by that Member or officer) or by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works (in the case of travel by an employee) and shall include—

"(1) a good faith estimate of total transportation expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(2) a good faith estimate of total lodging expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(3) a good faith estimate of total meal expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(4) a good faith estimate of the total of other expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;

"(5) a determination that all such expenses are necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses as defined in this paragraph; and

"(6) in the case of a reimbursement to a Member or officer, a determination that the travel was in connection with the duties of the Member or officer as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the Member or officer is using public office for private gain.

"(j) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses'—

"(1) includes reasonable expenses that are necessary for travel for a period not exceeding 3 days exclusive of travel time within the United States or 7 days exclusive of travel time outside of the United States unless approved in advance by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

"(2) is limited to reasonable expenditures for transportation, lodging, conference fees and materials, and food and refreshments, including reimbursement for necessary transportation, whether or not such transportation occurs within the periods described in clause (1);

"(3) does not include expenditures for recreational activities, nor does it include entertainment other than that provided to all attendees as an integral part of the event, except for activities or entertainment otherwise permissible under this rule; and

"(4) may include travel expenses incurred on behalf of either the spouse or a child of the Member, officer, or employee, subject to a determination signed by the Member or officer (or in the case of an employee, the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works) that the attendance of the spouse or child is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

"(k) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make available to the public all advance authorizations and disclosures of reimbursement filed pursuant to subparagraph (a) as soon as possible after they are received.

"(l) A gift prohibited by subparagraph (a) includes the following:

"(1) Anything provided by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal to an entity that is maintained or controlled by a Member, officer, or employee.

"(2) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal on the basis of a designation, recommendation, or other specification of a Member, officer, or employee (not including a mass mailing or other solicitation directed to a broad category of persons or entities), other than a charitable contribution permitted by subparagraph (p).

"(3) A contribution or other payment by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee.

"(4) A financial contribution or expenditure made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal relating to a conference, retreat, or similar event, sponsored by or affiliated with an official congressional organization, for or on behalf of Members, officers, or employees.

"(m) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal in lieu of an honorarium to a Member, officer, or employee shall not be considered a gift under this rule if it is reported as provided in subparagraph (b).

"(n) A Member, officer, or employee who designates or recommends a contribution to a charitable organization in lieu of honoraria described in subparagraph (a) shall report within 30 days after such designation or recommendation to the Clerk of the House of Representatives—

"(1) the name and address of the registered lobbyist who is making the contribution in lieu of honoraria;

"(2) the date and amount of the contribution; and

"(3) the name and address of the charitable organization designated or recommended by the Member.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make public information received pursuant to this subparagraph as soon as possible after it is received.

"(o) For purposes of this rule—

"(1) the term 'registered lobbyist' means a lobbyist registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act or any successor statute; and

"(2) the term 'agent of a foreign principal' means an agent of a foreign principal registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

"(p) All the provisions of this rule shall be interpreted and enforced solely by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized to issue guidance on any matter contained in this rule."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 402. This title and the amendment made by this title shall take effect on and be effective for calendar years beginning on January 1, 1996.

TITLE V—LOBBYING DISCLOSURE

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 501. This title may be cited as the "Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995".

FINDINGS

SEC. 502. The Congress finds that—

(1) responsible representative Government requires public awareness of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence the public decisionmaking process in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government;

(2) existing lobbying disclosure statutes have been ineffective because of unclear statutory language, weak administrative and enforcement provisions, and an absence of clear guidance as to who is required to register and what they are required to disclose; and

(3) the effective public disclosure of the identity and extent of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence Federal officials in the conduct of Government actions will increase public confidence in the integrity of Government.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 503. As used in this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLIENT.—The term "client" means any person or entity that employs or retains another person for financial or other compensation to conduct lobbying activities on behalf of that person or entity. A person or entity whose employees act as lobbyists on its own behalf is both a client and an employer of such employees. In the case of a coalition or association that employs or retains other persons to conduct lobbying activities, the client is the coalition or association and not its individual members.

(3) COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered executive branch official" means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) any officer or employee, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of such an officer or employee, in the Executive Office of the President;

(D) any officer or employee serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule, as designated by statute or Executive order;

(E) any member of the uniformed services whose pay grade is at or above O-7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and

(F) any officer or employee serving in a position of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character described in section 7511(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) COVERED LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered legislative branch official" means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) an elected officer of either House of Congress;

(C) any employee of, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of an employee of—

(i) a Member of Congress;

(ii) a committee of either House of Congress;

(iii) the leadership staff of the House of Representatives or the leadership staff of the Senate;

(iv) a joint committee of Congress; and

(v) a working group or caucus organized to provide legislative services or other assistance to Members of Congress; and

(D) any other legislative branch employee serving in a position described under section 109(13) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" means any individual who is an officer, employee, partner, director, or proprietor of a person or entity, but does not include—

(A) independent contractors; or

(B) volunteers who receive no financial or other compensation from the person or entity for their services.

(6) FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term "foreign entity" means a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b))).

(7) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—The term "lobbying activities" means lobbying contacts and efforts in support of such contacts, including preparation and planning activities, research and other background work that is intended, at the time it is performed, for use in contacts, and coordination with the lobbying activities of others.

(8) LOBBYING CONTACT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—The term "lobbying contact" means any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to—

(i) the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals);

(ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation, Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States Government;

(iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy (including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan, permit, or license); or

(iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position subject to confirmation by the Senate.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is—

(i) made by a public official acting in the public official's official capacity;

(ii) made by a representative of a media organization if the purpose of the communica-

tion is gathering and disseminating news and information to the public;

(iii) made in a speech, article, publication or other material that is distributed and made available to the public, or through radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication;

(iv) made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party and disclosed under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.);

(v) a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official;

(vi) made in the course of participation in an advisory committee subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

(vii) testimony given before a committee, subcommittee, or task force of the Congress, or submitted for inclusion in the public record of a hearing conducted by such committee, subcommittee, or task force;

(viii) information provided in writing in response to an oral or written request by a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official for specific information;

(ix) required by subpoena, civil investigative demand, or otherwise compelled by statute, regulation, or other action of the Congress or an agency;

(x) made in response to a notice in the Federal Register, Commerce Business Daily, or other similar publication soliciting communications from the public and directed to the agency official specifically designated in the notice to receive such communications;

(xi) not possible to report without disclosing information, the unauthorized disclosure of which is prohibited by law;

(xii) made to an official in an agency with regard to—

(I) a judicial proceeding or a criminal or civil law enforcement inquiry, investigation, or proceeding; or

(II) a filing or proceeding that the Government is specifically required by statute or regulation to maintain or conduct on a confidential basis,

if that agency is charged with responsibility for such proceeding, inquiry, investigation, or filing;

(xiii) made in compliance with written agency procedures regarding an adjudication conducted by the agency under section 554 of title 5, United States Code, or substantially similar provisions;

(xiv) a written comment filed in the course of a public proceeding or any other communication that is made on the record in a public proceeding;

(xv) a petition for agency action made in writing and required to be a matter of public record pursuant to established agency procedures;

(xvi) made on behalf of an individual with regard to that individual's benefits, employment, or other personal matters involving only that individual, except that this clause does not apply to any communication with—

(I) a covered executive branch official, or

(II) a covered legislative branch official (other than the individual's elected Members of Congress or employees who work under such Members' direct supervision),

with respect to the formulation, modification, or adoption of private legislation for the relief of that individual;

(xvii) a disclosure by an individual that is protected under the amendments made by the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989,

under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or under another provision of law;

(viii) made by—

(I) a church, its integrated auxiliary, or a convention or association of churches that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(i) of section 6033(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(II) a religious order that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(iii) of such section 6033(a); and

(ix) between—

(I) officials of a self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act) that is registered with or established by the Securities and Exchange Commission as required by that Act or a similar organization that is designated by or registered with the Commodities Future Trading Commission as provided under the Commodity Exchange Act; and

(II) the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodities Future Trading Commission, respectively;

relating to the regulatory responsibilities of such organization under that Act.

(9) **LOBBYING FIRM.**—The term "lobbying firm" means a person or entity that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists on behalf of a client other than that person or entity. The term also includes a self-employed individual who is a lobbyist.

(10) **LOBBYIST.**—The term "lobbyist" means any individual who is employed or retained by a client for financial or other compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact, other than an individual whose lobbying activities constitute less than 20 percent of the time engaged in the services provided by such individual to that client over a six month period.

(11) **MEDIA ORGANIZATION.**—The term "media organization" means a person or entity engaged in disseminating information to the general public through a newspaper, magazine, other publication, radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication.

(12) **MEMBER OF CONGRESS.**—The term "Member of Congress" means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(13) **ORGANIZATION.**—The term "organization" means a person or entity other than an individual.

(14) **PERSON OR ENTITY.**—The term "person or entity" means any individual, corporation, company, foundation, association, labor organization, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, group of organizations, or State or local government.

(15) **PUBLIC OFFICIAL.**—The term "public official" means any elected official, appointed official, or employee of—

(A) a Federal, State, or local unit of government in the United States other than—

(i) a college or university;

(ii) a government-sponsored enterprise (as defined in section 3(8) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974);

(iii) a public utility that provides gas, electricity, water, or communications;

(iv) a guaranty agency (as defined in section 435(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(j))), including any affiliate of such an agency; or

(v) an agency of any State functioning as a student loan secondary market pursuant to section 435(d)(1)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(d)(1)(F));

(B) a Government corporation (as defined in section 9101 of title 31, United States Code);

(C) an organization of State or local elected or appointed officials other than officials of an entity described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subparagraph (A);

(D) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)));

(E) a national or State political party or any organizational unit thereof; or

(F) a national, regional, or local unit of any foreign government.

(16) **STATE.**—The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS

SEC. 504. (a) REGISTRATION.—

(1) **GENERAL RULE.**—No later than 45 days after a lobbyist first makes a lobbying contact or is employed or retained to make a lobbying contact, whichever is earlier, such lobbyist (or, as provided under paragraph (2), the organization employing such lobbyist), shall register with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(2) **EMPLOYER FILING.**—Any organization that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists shall file a single registration under this section on behalf of such employees for each client on whose behalf the employees act as lobbyists.

(3) EXEMPTION.—

(A) **GENERAL RULE.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a person or entity whose—

(i) total income for matters related to lobbying activities on behalf of a particular client (in the case of a lobbying firm) does not exceed and is not expected to exceed \$5,000; or

(ii) total expenses in connection with lobbying activities (in the case of an organization whose employees engage in lobbying activities on its own behalf) do not exceed or are not expected to exceed \$20,000,

(as estimated under section 505) in the semiannual period described in section 505(a) during which the registration would be made is not required to register under subsection (a) with respect to such client.

(B) **ADJUSTMENT.**—The dollar amounts in subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted—

(i) on January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) since the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) on January 1 of each fourth year occurring after January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) during the preceding 4-year period,

rounded to the nearest \$500.

(b) **CONTENTS OF REGISTRATION.**—Each registration under this section shall contain—

(1) the name, address, business telephone number, and principal place of business of the registrant, and a general description of its business or activities;

(2) the name, address, and principal place of business of the registrant's client, and a general description of its business or activities (if different from paragraph (1));

(3) the name, address, and principal place of business of any organization, other than the client, that—

(A) contributes more than \$10,000 toward the lobbying activities of the registrant in a semiannual period described in section 505(a); and

(B) in whole or in major part plans, supervises, or controls such lobbying activities.

(4) the name, address, principal place of business, amount of any contribution of more than \$10,000 to the lobbying activities of the registrant, and approximate percentage of equitable ownership in the client (if any) of any foreign entity that—

(A) holds at least 20 percent equitable ownership in the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3);

(B) directly or indirectly, in whole or in major part, plans, supervises, controls, directs, finances, or subsidizes the activities of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3); or

(C) is an affiliate of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3) and has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity;

(5) a statement of—

(A) the general issue areas in which the registrant expects to engage in lobbying activities on behalf of the client; and

(B) to the extent practicable, specific issues that have (as of the date of the registration) already been addressed or are likely to be addressed in lobbying activities; and

(6) the name of each employee of the registrant who has acted or whom the registrant expects to act as a lobbyist on behalf of the client and, if any such employee has served as a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official in the 2 years before the date on which such employee first acted (after the date of enactment of this Act) as a lobbyist on behalf of the client, the position in which such employee served.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR REGISTRATION.—

(1) **MULTIPLE CLIENTS.**—In the case of a registrant making lobbying contacts on behalf of more than 1 client, a separate registration under this section shall be filed for each such client.

(2) **MULTIPLE CONTACTS.**—A registrant who makes more than 1 lobbying contact for the same client shall file a single registration covering all such lobbying contacts.

(d) **TERMINATION OF REGISTRATION.**—A registrant who after registration—

(1) is no longer employed or retained by a client to conduct lobbying activities; and

(2) does not anticipate any additional lobbying activities for such client,

may so notify the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and terminate its registration.

REPORTS BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS

SEC. 505. (a) **SEMIANNUAL REPORT.**—No later than 45 days after the end of the semiannual period beginning on the first day of each January and the first day of July of each year in which a registrant is registered under section 504, each registrant shall file a report with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives on its lobbying activities during such semiannual period. A separate report shall be filed for each client of the registrant.

(b) **CONTENTS OF REPORT.**—Each semiannual report filed under subsection (a) shall contain—

(1) the name of the registrant, the name of the client, and any changes or updates to the information provided in the initial registration;

(2) for each general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying activities on behalf of the client during the semiannual filing period—

(A) a list of the specific issues upon which a lobbyist employed by the registrant engaged in lobbying activities, including, to the maximum extent practicable, a list of bill numbers and references to specific executive branch actions;

(B) a statement of the Houses of Congress and the Federal agencies contacted by lobbyists employed by the registrant on behalf of the client;

(C) a list of the employees of the registrant who acted as lobbyists on behalf of the client; and

(D) a description of the interest, if any, of any foreign entity identified under section 504(b)(4) in the specific issues listed under subparagraph (A).

(3) in the case of a lobbying firm, a good faith estimate of the total amount of all income from the client (including any payments to the registrant by any other person for lobbying activities on behalf of the client) during the semiannual period, other than income for matters that are unrelated to lobbying activities; and

(4) in the case of a registrant engaged in lobbying activities on its own behalf, a good faith estimate of the total expenses that the registrant and its employees incurred in connection with lobbying activities during the semiannual filing period.

(c) **ESTIMATES OF INCOME OR EXPENSES.**—For purposes of this section, estimates of income or expenses shall be made as follows:

(1) Estimates of amounts in excess of \$10,000 shall be rounded to the nearest \$20,000.

(2) In the event income or expenses do not exceed \$10,000, the registrant shall include a statement that income or expenses totaled less than \$10,000 for the reporting period.

(3) A registrant that reports lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may satisfy the requirement to report income or expenses by filing with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives a copy of the form filed in accordance with section 6033(b)(8).

DISCLOSURE AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 506. The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall—

(1) provide guidance and assistance on the registration and reporting requirements of this title and develop common standards, rules, and procedures for compliance with this title;

(2) review, and, where necessary, verify and inquire to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of registration and reports;

(3) develop filing, coding, and cross-indexing systems to carry out the purpose of this title, including—

(A) a publicly available list of all registered lobbyists, lobbying firms, and their clients; and

(B) computerized systems designed to minimize the burden of filing and maximize public access to materials filed under this title;

(4) make available for public inspection and copying at reasonable times the registrations and reports filed under this title;

(5) retain registrations for a period of at least 6 years after they are terminated and reports for a period of at least 6 years after they are filed;

(6) compile and summarize, with respect to each semiannual period, the information contained in registrations and reports filed with respect to such period in a clear and complete manner;

(7) notify any lobbyist or lobbying firm in writing that may be in noncompliance with this title; and

(8) notify the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia that a lobbyist or lobbying firm may be in noncompliance with this title, if the registrant has been notified

in writing and has failed to provide an appropriate response within 60 days after notice was given under paragraph (6).

PENALTIES

SEC. 507. Whoever knowingly fails to—

(1) remedy a defective filing within 60 days after notice of such a defect by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives; or

(2) comply with any other provision of this title; shall, upon proof of such knowing violation by a preponderance of the evidence, be subject to a civil fine of not more than \$50,000, depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 508. (a) **CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit or interfere with—

(1) the right to petition the government for the redress of grievances;

(2) the right to express a personal opinion; or

(3) the right of association, protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

(b) **PROHIBITION OF ACTIVITIES.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit, or to authorize any court to prohibit, lobbying activities or lobbying contacts by any person or entity, regardless of whether such person or entity is in compliance with the requirements of this title.

(c) **AUDIT AND INVESTIGATIONS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to grant general audit or investigative authority to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

SEC. 509. The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1—

(A) by striking subsection (j);

(B) in subsection (c) by striking “the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence” and inserting “any activity that the person engaging in believes will, or that the person intends to, in any way influence”;

(C) in subsection (p) by striking the semi-colon and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subsection (q);

(2) in section 3(g) (22 U.S.C. 613(g)), by striking “established agency proceedings, whether formal or informal,” and inserting “judicial proceedings, criminal or civil law enforcement inquiries, investigations, or proceedings, or agency proceedings required by statute or regulation to be conducted on the record.”;

(3) in section 3 (22 U.S.C. 613) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) Any agent of a person described in section 1(b)(2) or an entity described in section 1(b)(3) if the agent is required to register and does register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the agent's representation of such person or entity.”;

(4) in section 4(a) (22 U.S.C. 614(a))—

(A) by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”; and

(B) by striking “and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such an agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal”;

(5) in section 4(b) (22 U.S.C. 614(b))—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”; and

(B) by striking “(i) in the form of prints, or” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting “without placing in such informational materials a conspicuous statement that the materials are distributed by the agent on behalf of the foreign principal, and that additional information is on file with the Department of Justice, Washington, District of Columbia. The Attorney General may by rule define what constitutes a conspicuous statement for the purposes of this subsection.”;

(6) in section 4(c) (22 U.S.C. 614(c)), by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”;

(7) in section 6 (22 U.S.C. 616)—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking “and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda”;

(B) in subsection (b) by striking “, and one copy of every item of political propaganda”; and

(C) in subsection (c) by striking “copies of political propaganda.”;

(8) in section 8 (22 U.S.C. 618)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2) by striking “or in any statement under section 4(a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda”; and

(B) by striking subsection (d); and

(9) in section 11 (22 U.S.C. 621) by striking “, including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed”.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BYRD AMENDMENT

SEC. 510. (a) **REVISED CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 1352(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting the following:

“(A) the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person with respect to that Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement; and

“(B) a certification that the person making the declaration has not made, and will not make, any payment prohibited by subsection (a).”;

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking all that follows “loan shall contain” and inserting “the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person in connection with that loan insurance or guarantee.”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(b) **REMOVAL OF OBSOLETE REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Section 1352 of title 31, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN LOBBYING PROVISIONS

SEC. 511. (a) **REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT.**—The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 261 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) **REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO HOUSING LOBBYIST ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) Section 13 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3537b) is repealed.

(2) Section 536(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490p(d)) is repealed.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 512. (a) **AMENDMENT TO COMPETITIVENESS POLICY COUNCIL ACT.**—Section 5206(e) of the Competitiveness Policy Council Act (15 U.S.C. 4804(e)) is amended by inserting “or a

lobbyist for a foreign entity (as the terms 'lobbyist' and 'foreign entity' are defined under section 503 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995) after "an agent for a foreign principal".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 219(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or a lobbyist required to register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the representation of a foreign entity, as defined in section 503(7) of that Act" after "an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938"; and

(2) by striking out ", as amended,".

(c) AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1980.—Section 602(c) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4002(c)) is amended by inserting "or a lobbyist for a foreign entity (as defined in section 503(7) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995)" after "an agent of a foreign principal (as defined by section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938)".

SEVERABILITY

SEC. 513. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this title and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

IDENTIFICATION OF CLIENTS AND COVERED OFFICIALS

SEC. 514. (a) ORAL LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity that makes an oral lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall, on the request of the official at the time of the lobbying contact—

(1) state whether the person or entity is registered under this title and identify the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact is made; and

(2) state whether such client is a foreign entity and identify any foreign entity required to be disclosed under section 504(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(b) WRITTEN LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity registered under this title that makes a written lobbying contact (including an electronic communication) with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall—

(1) if the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact was made is a foreign entity, identify such client, state that the client is considered a foreign entity under this title, and state whether the person making the lobbying contact is registered on behalf of that client under section 504; and

(2) identify any other foreign entity identified pursuant to section 504(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(c) IDENTIFICATION AS COVERED OFFICIAL.—Upon request by a person or entity making a lobbying contact, the individual who is contacted or the office employing that individual shall indicate whether or not the individual is a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official.

ESTIMATES BASED ON TAX REPORTING SYSTEM

SEC. 515. (a) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 6033(b) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is required to report and does report lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would be required to be disclosed under such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 504(a)(3), 505(a)(2), and 505(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 503(8) of this title, consider as lobbying activities only those activities that are influencing legislation as defined in section 4911(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 162(e) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is subject to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would not be deductible pursuant to such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 504(a)(3), 505(a)(2), and 505(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 503(8) of this title, consider as lobbying activities only those activities, the costs of which are not deductible pursuant to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF ESTIMATE.—Any registrant that elects to make estimates required by this title under the procedures au-

thorized by subsection (a) or (b) for reporting or threshold purposes shall—

(1) inform the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives that the registrant has elected to make its estimates under such procedures; and

(2) make all such estimates, in a given calendar year, under such procedures.

(d) STUDY.—Not later than March 31, 1997, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review reporting by registrants under subsections (a) and (b) and report to the Congress—

(1) the differences between the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 503(8) and the definitions of "lobbying expenditures", "influencing legislation", and related terms in sections 162(e) and 4911 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as each are implemented by regulations;

(2) the impact that any such differences may have on filing and reporting under this title pursuant to this subsection; and

(3) any changes to this title or to the appropriate sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that the Comptroller General may recommend to harmonize the definitions.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 516. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on January 1, 1996.

(b) The repeals and amendments made under sections 513, 514, and 515 shall take effect as provided under subsection (a), except that such repeals and amendments—

(1) shall not affect any proceeding or suit commenced before the effective date under subsection (a), and in all such proceedings or suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this title had not been enacted; and

(2) shall not affect the requirements of Federal agencies to compile, publish, and retain information filed or received before the effective date of such repeals and amendments.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I further include at this point in the RECORD the following material concerning floor procedure during the 104th Congress:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS, COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	35R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl 2, cl 5(b), and cl 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority. Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	1D
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliley amendment (30 min) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1977 "Rule Defeated"	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl 6 and cl 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	*RULE AMENDED* Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. makes in order the committee substitute as original text.	N/A
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl 7 of rule XVI and cl 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute. provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl 2(l)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a senate hook-up after adoption.	1D
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5(c) of rule XXI (½ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all points of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 59(c) of rule XXI (½ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Test Reform			

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us really to stop the ballyhoo and just tell the truth; just with a swift 1-day hearing on Medicare and an overwhelming and devastating vote last week, we tore the Medicare Program apart. But yet we are being asked today to put off for tomorrow what we can actually do today.

This is a bipartisan effort. We need to throw away the gifts, the golf clubs and whatever else takes us away from the work of this body.

I came to this Congress just this year as a freshman, and on the very first day I stood up and spoke against gifts and lobbyists who cloud the issues and sometimes write the legislation. It is time now to defeat the previous question and join the leadership of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas, both of whom have worked consistently in this bipartisan effort to support gift ban legislation.

What is the problem of voting today on gift and lobby reform. This legislation is the people's legislation—it is important to vote on this legislation to reform our own House today.

Let me also correct the record. In the 103d Congress this U.S. Congress, under Democratic rule, voted overwhelmingly for gift and lobby reform. It then went to the Senate. The conference report was accepted by the House with gift and lobby reform included. The House again voted overwhelmingly. Do you know what happened then, the reason why it was not passed, because there was a Republican filibuster led by the gentleman from Kansas, in the other body, who helped defeat important gift and lobby reform.

It is important to defeat the previous question. It is time now today to vote in the right direction for the U.S. Congress to support today gift and lobby reform by defeating the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, why put off for tomorrow what you can do today? This should be a bipartisan effort. The issue of gift and lobby reform has

been an issue that I have supported since I became a Member of Congress 10 months ago. In fact, on the day that I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, I expressed my views that there was a strong need for gift reform and lobby reform so that we could increase the confidence of the American people in their elected representatives.

The Senate has already supported gift and lobby reform in a resounding vote with 98 Senators supporting reform and no Senators opposing reform. It is clear to me that we should act without delay.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question on the rule on the legislative branch appropriations bill so that we can amend the rule to include certain provisions on gift and lobby reform.

The provisions that Congressmen FAZIO and BRYANT would like to offer are reasonable and ought to be supported by all Members of the House of Representatives. Those provisions are identical to provisions passed by the Senate.

The provisions would limit the total value of gifts that a Member or a staff member could accept to \$100 per year from any source. No individual gift including meals or entertainment

could cost more than \$50. Free travel for recreational events such as charity, golf, and ski trips would be prohibited. Meetings and fact-finding trips in connection with official duties would still be permissible.

Many Members of the House have spoken in previous months on the need for reform. Now is the time to act. If we include these provisions in the legislative branch appropriations bill, the President would be in a position to sign those provisions into law as soon as possible.

□ 1130

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, you know, sometimes these gifts come gift wrapped, with a ski trip, a golf fee being paid, a little Cabernet Sauvignon. Sometimes they are not big enough to hold the gifts that come. Because the whole problem is that our Republican colleagues, when they talk about reform, and it is an amazing response to our request for bipartisan support to clean this place up, instead of getting a broom, they get a golf club. They have been unwilling to stand up to the golf caucus in this House. Since day one, they have given us plenty of speeches, they have given us plenty of talk of delay, but they have done absolutely nothing to separate the union between this Congress and the lobby. In fact, they place the lobby on the committee dais. They turned over committee computers to the lobby to write the bills up here. We ought to be putting the lobby names on some of these reforms, like the Gingrich golden rule Medicare cut bill that we passed here a couple of weeks ago.

That is the way they have chosen to operate this House. And now, now that we have pressured them to come forward with reform, after they voted against cleaning this House up on January 4, they voted against cleaning this House up on June 20, they voted against cleaning this House up on June 22, they voted against cleaning this House up on September 6, last week they got so scared about it they jerked this bill off the floor. So, finally, after all the pressure from the Democratic Party, which last year the Democrat Congress passed reform twice, only to see Republicans kill it over in the Senate, finally, they have given us their answer: They held another press conference.

Well, is that not marvelous? At that press conference they told us, as they have this morning, oh, they want to improve the Senate bill. They want to strengthen it. And what was the one example that they gave us of strengthening it at that great press conference? The golf caucus ruled again. They said they might have an exemption for us in the Senate bill to allow more golf gatherings to occur. That is the kind of reform we have been promised here.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that what we need is not more speeches, not more press releases, but a little more bipartisanship. Indeed, in the words of an old Texas song, what we need is a little less talk, and a lot more action. It is time to get down to the main attraction, which is not a matter of showmanship, but a matter of action on this bill.

Dr. King said it more eloquently, when he said that often wait means never. And that is exactly what it means. They have a plan to delay this bill and delay reform, to respond to the golf caucus, not to the needs of the American people.

It is time to clean up this House, and to do it today; not with a golf club, but with a broom. All we are asking is that bill that these very Members say they have sponsored, that they support, a bill that was approved in the U.S. Senate by a vote of 98 to 0, with Republicans and Democrats coming together, that that be made law today; not next week, not never.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, after 40 years of status quo, we have passed more reforms in this House than they have proposed in 40 years; and now we have a commitment by the leadership of this House to bring forth this legislation on gift and lobbying reform before November 16 to this House. That is after balancing the Federal budget, after 40 years of lack of action by the other side, and after saving Medicare.

I am proud of what this leadership has done. I am proud of the commitment to bring forth what they been posturing about, in reality and genuinely, before November 16.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces he will reduce to minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 184, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 746]

YEAS—235

Allard
Archer

Armey
Bachus

Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)

Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Billie
Blute
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chryslers
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremins
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dorman
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly

Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick

Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tausz
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traffant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—184

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Browder
Brown (CA)

Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner

de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans

Farr	Lowey	Roemer
Pattah	Luther	Rose
Fazio	Maloney	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Manton	Rush
Flake	Markey	Sabo
Foglietta	Martinez	Sanders
Ford	Mascara	Sawyer
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Schroeder
Frost	McCarthy	Schumer
Furse	McDermott	Scott
Gedenson	McHale	Serrano
Gephardt	McKinney	Sisisky
Geren	McNulty	Skaggs
Gibbons	Meehan	Skelton
Gonzalez	Meek	Slaughter
Gordon	Menendez	Spratt
Green	Miller (CA)	Stark
Gutierrez	Minge	Stenholm
Hall (OH)	Mink	Stokes
Hall (TX)	Mollohan	Studds
Hamilton	Montgomery	Stupak
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Tanner
Hefner	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Hinchey	Nadler	Tejeda
Holden	Neal	Thompson
Hoyer	Oberstar	Thornton
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Thurman
Jacobs	Oliver	Torres
Jefferson	Ortiz	Torricelli
Johnson (SD)	Orton	Towns
Johnson, E.B.	Owens	Velazquez
Johnston	Pallone	Vento
Kanjorski	Pastor	Visclosky
Kennedy (MA)	Payne (NJ)	Volkmmer
Kennedy (RI)	Payne (VA)	Ward
Kennelly	Pelosi	Waters
Kildee	Peterson (FL)	Watt (NC)
Klecicka	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Klink	Pickett	Williams
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Wise
Lantos	Poshard	Woolsey
Levin	Rahall	Wyden
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wynn
Lincoln	Reed	Yates
Lipinski	Richardson	
Lofgren	Rivers	

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews	Hilliard	Riggs
Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Tucker
Conyers	Mfume	Weldon (PA)
Fields (LA)	Moakley	
Harman	Oxley	

□ 1154

Messrs. SKELTON, MARTINEZ, and PETERSON of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DICKEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2429, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material and charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 239, I call up the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2492 is as follows:

H.R. 2492

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS
SENATE

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES

For expense allowances of the Vice President, \$10,000; the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, \$10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, \$10,000; Minority Leader of the Senate, \$10,000; Majority Whip of the Senate, \$5,000; Minority Whip of the Senate, \$5,000; and Chairmen of the Majority and Minority Conference Committees, \$3,000 for each Chairman; in all, \$56,000.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES FOR THE
MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

For representation allowances of the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate, \$15,000 for each such Leader; in all, \$30,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers, employees, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions, \$69,727,000, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For the Office of the Vice President, \$1,513,000.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

For the Office of the President Pro Tempore, \$325,000.

OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY
LEADERS

For Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders, \$2,195,000.

OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

For Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips, \$656,000.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

For the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the Chairman of each such committee, \$996,000 for each such committee; in all, \$1,992,000.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES OF THE CON-
FERENCE OF THE MAJORITY AND THE CON-
FERENCE OF THE MINORITY

For Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority, \$360,000.

POLICY COMMITTEES

For salaries of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$965,000 for each such committee, in all, \$1,930,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN

For Office of the Chaplain, \$192,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For Office of the Secretary, \$12,128,000.

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND
DOORKEEPER

For Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$31,889,000.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE
MAJORITY AND MINORITY

For Offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, \$1,047,000.

AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS AND RELATED
EXPENSES

For agency contributions for employee benefits, as authorized by law, and related expenses, \$15,500,000.

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE
SENATE

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, \$3,381,000.

OFFICE OF SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Senate Legal Counsel, \$936,000.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE SECRETARY OF
THE SENATE, SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOOR-
KEEPER OF THE SENATE, AND SECRETARIES
FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY OF THE
SENATE

For expense allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, \$3,000; Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, \$3,000; Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, \$3,000; Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, \$3,000; in all, \$12,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, section 112 of Public Law 96-304 and Senate Resolution 281, agreed to March 11, 1980, \$66,395,000.

EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

CAUCUS ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL
For expenses of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, \$305,000.

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, \$1,266,000.

SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE
SENATE

For expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, \$61,347,000.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For miscellaneous items, \$6,644,000.

SENATORS' OFFICIAL PERSONNEL AND OFFICE
EXPENSE ACCOUNT

For Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account, \$204,029,000.

OFFICE OF SENATE FAIR EMPLOYMENT
PRACTICES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices, \$778,000.

SETTLEMENTS AND AWARDS RESERVE

For expenses for settlements and awards, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For stationery for the President of the Senate, \$4,500, for officers of the Senate and the Conference of the Majority and Conference of the Minority of the Senate, \$8,500; in all, \$13,000.

OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For expenses necessary for official mail costs of the Senate, \$11,000,000.

RESCISSION

Of the funds previously appropriated under the heading "SENATE", \$63,544,724.12 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. (a) On and after October 1, 1995, no Senator shall receive mileage under section 17 of the Act of July 28, 1866 (2 U.S.C. 43).

(b) On and after October 1, 1995, the President of the Senate shall not receive mileage under the first section of the Act of July 8, 1935 (2 U.S.C. 43a).

SEC. 2. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States within the contingent fund of the Senate a revolving fund, to be known as the "Office of the Chaplain Expense Revolving Fund" (hereafter referred to as the "fund"). The fund shall consist of all moneys collected or received with respect to the Office of the Chaplain of the Senate.

(b) The fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for disbursement by the Secretary of the Senate, not to exceed \$10,000 in any fiscal year, for the payment of official expenses incurred by the Chaplain of the Senate. In addition, moneys in the fund may be used to purchase food or food related items. The fund shall not be available for the payment of salaries.

(c) All moneys (including donated moneys) received or collected with respect to the Office of the Chaplain of the Senate shall be deposited in the fund and shall be available for purposes of this section.

(d) Disbursements from the fund shall be made on vouchers approved by the Chaplain of the Senate.

SEC. 3. Funds appropriated under the heading, "Settlements and Awards Reserve" in Public Law 103-283 shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. Section 902 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1983 (2 U.S.C. 88b-6) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "The amounts so withheld shall be deposited in the revolving fund, within the contingent fund of the Senate, for the Daniel Webster Senate Page Residence, as established by section 4 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995 (2 U.S.C. 88b-7)."

SEC. 5. (a) Any payment for local and long distance telecommunications service provided to any user by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall cover the total invoiced amount, including any amount relating to separately identified toll calls, and shall be charged to the appropriation for the fiscal year in which the underlying base service period covered by the invoice ends.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "user" means any Senator, Officer of the Senate, Committee, office, or entity provided telephone equipment and services by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

SEC. 6. Section 4(b) of Public Law 103-283 is amended by inserting before "collected" the following: "(including donated moneys)".

SEC. 7. Section 1 of Public Law 101-520 (2 U.S.C. 61g-6a) is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a)(1) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Policy Committee of the Senate may, during any fiscal year, at his or her election transfer funds from the appropriation account for salaries for the Majority and Minority Policy Committees of the Senate, to the account, within the contingent fund of the Senate, from which expenses are payable for such committees.

"(2) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Policy Committee of the Senate may,

during any fiscal year, at his or her election transfer funds from the appropriation account for expenses, within the contingent fund of the Senate, for the Majority and Minority Policy Committees of the Senate, to the account from which salaries are payable for such committees.

"(b)(1) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Conference Committee of the Senate may, during any fiscal year, at his or her election transfer funds from the appropriation account for salaries for the Majority and Minority Conference Committees of the Senate, to the account, within the contingent fund of the Senate, from which expenses are payable for such committees.

"(2) The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Conference Committee of the Senate may, during any fiscal year, at his or her election transfer funds from the appropriation account for expenses, within the contingent fund of the Senate, for the Majority and Minority Conference Committees of the Senate, to the account from which salaries are payable for such committees.

"(c) Any funds transferred under this section shall be—

"(1) available for expenditure by such committee in like manner and for the same purposes as are other moneys which are available for expenditure by such committee from the account to which the funds were transferred; and

"(2) made at such time or times as the Chairman shall specify in writing to the Senate Disbursing Office.

"(d) The Chairman of a committee transferring funds under this section shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the transfer."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1995, and shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after that date.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$671,561,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$11,271,000, including: Office of the Speaker, \$1,478,000, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$1,470,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$1,480,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$928,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$918,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, \$376,000; Republican Steering Committee, \$664,000; Republican Conference, \$1,083,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, \$1,181,000; Democratic Caucus, \$566,000; and nine minority employees, \$1,127,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$360,503,000: *Provided*, That no such funds shall be used for the purposes of sending unsolicited mass mailings within 90 days before an election in which the Member is a candidate.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$78,629,000.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$16,945,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$83,733,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not to exceed \$1,000 for official representation and reception expenses, \$13,807,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not to exceed \$750 for official representation and reception expenses, \$3,410,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, \$53,556,000, including salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Resources, \$27,500,000, of which \$16,000,000 is provided herein: *Provided*, That House Information Resources is authorized to receive reimbursement from Members of the House of Representatives and other governmental entities for services provided and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$3,954,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, \$858,000; Office of the Chaplain, \$126,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$1,180,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$1,700,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$4,524,000; and other authorized employees, \$618,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$120,480,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$1,213,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$1,000,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursements, \$68,000; Government contributions to employees' life insurance fund, retirement funds, Social Security fund, Medicare fund, health benefits fund, and worker's and unemployment compensation, \$117,541,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$658,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(d)(1)), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1995, in the

case of mail from outside sources presented to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives (other than mail through the Postal Service and mail with postage otherwise paid) for internal delivery in the House of Representatives, the Chief Administrative Officer is authorized to collect fees equal to the applicable postage. Amounts received by the Chief Administrative Officer as fees under the preceding sentence shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 102. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1995, amounts received by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives from the Administrator of General Services for rebates under the Government Travel Charge Card Program shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 103. The provisions of section 223(b) of House Resolution 6, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, establishing the Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities; House Resolution 7, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing for the designation of certain minority employees; House Resolution 9, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing amounts for the Republican Steering Committee and the Democratic Policy Committee; House Resolution 10, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, providing for the transfer of two employee positions; and House Resolution 113, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to March 10, 1995, providing for the transfer of certain employee positions shall each be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) The five statutory positions specified in subsection (b), subsection (c), and subsection (d) are transferred from the House Republican Conference to the Republican Steering Committee.

(b) The first two of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 393, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to March 31, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 74a-3); and

(2) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by section 102(a)(4) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990;

both of which positions were transferred to the majority leader by House Resolution 10, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to January 5 (legislative day, January 4), 1995, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of this Act, and both of which positions were further transferred to the House Republican Conference by House Resolution 113, One Hundred Fourth Congress, agreed to March 10, 1995, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of this Act.

(c) The second two of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) are the two positions established by section 103(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1986.

(d) The fifth of the five positions referred to in subsection (a) is the position for the House Republican Conference established by House Resolution 625, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to October 22, 1965, as enacted into permanent law by section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1967.

(e) The transfers under this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any rule, regulation, or other authority, travel for studies and examinations under section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(b)) shall be governed by applicable laws or regulations of the House of Representatives or as promulgated from time to time by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to travel performed on or after that date.

SEC. 106. (a) Notwithstanding the paragraph under the heading "GENERAL PROVISION" in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 102a) or any other provision of law, effective on the date of the enactment of this section, unexpended balances in accounts described in subsection (b) are withdrawn, with unpaid obligations to be liquidated in the manner provided in the second sentence of that paragraph.

(b) The accounts referred to in subsection (a) are the House of Representatives legislative service organization revolving accounts under section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1994 (2 U.S.C. 96a).

SEC. 107. (a) Each fund and account specified in subsection (b) shall be available only to the extent provided in appropriations Acts.

(b) The funds and accounts referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the revolving fund for the House Barber Shops, established by the paragraph under the heading "HOUSE BARBER SHOPS REVOLVING FUND" in the matter relating to the House of Representatives in chapter III of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1975 (Public Law 93-554; 88 Stat. 1776);

(2) the revolving fund for the House Beauty Shop, established by the matter under the heading "HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP" in the matter relating to administrative provisions for the House of Representatives in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1970 (Public Law 91-145; 83 Stat. 347);

(3) the special deposit account established for the House of Representatives Restaurant by section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (40 U.S.C. 174k note); and

(4) the revolving fund established for the House Recording Studio by section 105(g) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 123b(g)).

(c) This section shall take effect on October 1, 1995, and shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 107A. For fiscal year 1996, subject to the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives, of the total amount deposited in the account referred to in section 107(b)(3) of this Act from vending operations of the House of Representatives Restaurant System, the cost of goods sold shall be available to pay the cost of inventory for such operations.

SEC. 108. The House Employees Position Classification Act (2 U.S.C. 291, et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(1), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General";

(2) in the first sentence of section 4(b), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General";

(3) in section 5(b)(1), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster" and inserting in

lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General"; and

(4) in the first sentence of section 5(c), by striking out "Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster," and inserting in lieu thereof "Chief Administrative Officer, and the Inspector General".

SEC. 109. (a) Upon the approval of the appropriate employing authority, an employee of the House of Representatives who is separated from employment, may be paid a lump sum for the accrued annual leave of the employee. The lump sum—

(1) shall be paid in an amount not more than the lesser of—

(A) the amount of the monthly pay of the employee, as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; or

(B) the amount equal to the monthly pay of the employee, as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, divided by 30, and multiplied by the number of days of the accrued annual leave of the employee;

(2) shall be paid—

(A) for clerk hire employees, from the clerk hire allowance of the Member;

(B) for committee employees, from amounts appropriated for committees; and

(C) for other employees, from amounts appropriated to the employing authority; and

(3) shall be based on the rate of pay in effect with respect to the employee on the last day of employment of the employee.

(b) The Committee on House Oversight shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) As used in this section, the term "employee of the House of Representatives" means an employee whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, as applicable, except that such term does not include a uniformed or civilian support employee under the Capitol Police Board.

(d) Payments under this section may be made with respect to separations from employment taking place after June 30, 1995.

SEC. 110. (a)(1) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the allowances for office personnel and equipment for certain Members of the House of Representatives, as adjusted through the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, are further adjusted as specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The further adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) The allowance for the majority leader is increased by \$167,532.

(B) The allowance for the majority whip is decreased by \$167,532.

(b)(1) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the House of Representatives allowances referred to in paragraph (2), as adjusted through the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, are further adjusted, or are established, as the case may be, as specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The further adjustments and the establishment referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) The allowance for the Republican Conference is increased by \$134,491.

(B) The allowance for the Republican Steering Committee is established at \$66,995.

(C) The allowance for the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee is increased by \$201,430.

(D) The allowance for the Democratic Caucus is increased by \$56.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$3,000,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$750,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$5,116,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of \$1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$500 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (3) an allowance of \$500 per month to one assistant and \$400 per month each to not to exceed nine assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (4) \$852,000 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,260,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than \$600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions to employees' benefits funds, as authorized by law, of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, \$70,132,000, of which \$34,213,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, and \$35,919,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, the employee assistance program, not more than \$2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and \$85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, \$2,560,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training

for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1996 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 111. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1996 for the Capitol Police Board under the heading "CAPITOL POLICE" may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES", upon approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, \$1,991,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to employ more than forty individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, \$30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 112. Section 310 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990 (2 U.S.C. 130e), is amended—

- (1) by striking out "Clerk" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sergeant at Arms"; and
- (2) by striking out "Librarian of Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof "Architect of the Capitol".

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of Public Law 104-1, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), \$2,500,000, of which \$500,000 shall be transferred from the amount provided for salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance under the headings "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES", "Salaries and Expenses", and "Salaries, Officers and Employees".

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the orderly closure of the Office of Technology Assessment, \$3,615,000, of which \$150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1997. Upon enactment of this Act, \$2,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 103-283 shall remain available until September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Office of Technology Assessment in excess of 17 employees except for severance pay purposes.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 113. Upon enactment of this Act all employees of the Office of Technology Assessment for 183 days preceding termination of employment who are terminated as a re-

sult of the elimination of the Office and who are not otherwise gainfully employed may continue to be paid by the Office of Technology Assessment at their respective salaries for a period not to exceed 60 calendar days following the employee's date of termination or until the employee becomes otherwise gainfully employed whichever is earlier. Any day for which a former employee receives a payment under this section shall be counted as Federal service for purposes of determining entitlement to benefits, including retirement, annual and sick leave earnings, and health and life insurance. A statement in writing to the Director of the Office of Technology Assessment or his designee by any such employee that he was not gainfully employed during such period or the portion thereof for which payment is claimed shall be accepted as prima facie evidence that he was not so employed.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, or any other provision of law, upon the abolition of the Office of Technology Assessment, all records and property of the Office (including the Unix system, all computer hardware and software, all library collections and research materials, and all photocopying equipment), shall be under the administrative control of the Architect of the Capitol. Not later than December 31, 1995, the Architect shall submit a proposal to transfer such records and property to appropriate support agencies of the Legislative Branch which request such transfer, and shall carry out such transfer subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not to exceed \$2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$24,288,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Congressional Budget Office in excess of 232 full-time equivalent positions: *Provided further*, That any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to be a sale or lease of such property, supplies, or services to the Congress subject to section 903 of Public Law 98-63: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to dispose of surplus or obsolete personal property by inter-agency transfer, donation, or discarding.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 115. Section 8402(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and
- (2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) The Director of the Congressional Budget Office may exclude from the operation of this chapter an employee under the Congressional Budget Office whose employment is temporary or intermittent."

**ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
SALARIES**

For the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law, \$8,569,000.

TRAVEL

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of \$20,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies, and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under his care, \$100,000.

**CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS
CAPITOL BUILDINGS**

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; including not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$22,882,000, of which \$2,950,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter expenses, based on full cost recovery, for flying American flags and providing certification services therefor shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$5,143,000, of which \$25,000 shall remain available until expended.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for maintenance, care and operation of Senate Office Buildings; and furniture and furnishings to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, \$41,757,000, of which \$4,850,000 shall remain available until expended.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, \$33,001,000, of which \$5,261,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Li-

brary, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$31,518,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1996.

**LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$60,084,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material thereof (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

**GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING**

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semi-monthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$83,770,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 1996".

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$3,053,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 201 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1993 (40 U.S.C. 216c note) is amended by striking out "\$6,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000".

(b) Section 307E(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (40 U.S.C.

216c(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "plans" and inserting in lieu thereof "plants".

**LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress, not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$211,664,000, of which not more than \$7,869,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1996 under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$7,869,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$8,458,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, \$30,818,000, of which not more than \$16,840,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1996 under 17 U.S.C. 708(c), and not more than \$2,990,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1996 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$19,830,000: *Provided further*, That up to \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,250 may be expended on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute.

**BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY
HANDICAPPED**

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$44,951,000, of which \$11,694,000 shall remain available until expended.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$4,882,000, of which \$943,000 shall be available until expended only for the purchase and supply of furniture, shelving, furnishings, and related costs necessary for the renovation and restoration of the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Library buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$194,290, of which \$58,100 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 203. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15; and

(2) grants such manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "manager or supervisor" means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a) (10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 204. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 205. Not to exceed \$5,000 of any funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Library of Congress incentive awards program.

SEC. 206. Not to exceed \$12,000 of funds appropriated to the Library of Congress may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress or his designee, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 207. Under the heading "Library of Congress" obligatory authority shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$99,412,000 for reimbursable and revolving fund activities, and \$6,812,000 for non-expenditure transfer activities in support of parliamentary development during the current fiscal year.

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding this or any other Act, obligatory authority under the heading "Library of Congress" for activities in support of parliamentary development is prohibited, except for Russia, Ukraine, Albania, Slovakia, and Romania, for other than incidental purposes.

SEC. 209. (a) The purpose of this section is to reduce the cost of information support for the Congress by eliminating duplication among systems which provide electronic access by Congress to legislative information.

(b) As used in this section, the term "legislative information" means information, prepared within the legislative branch, consisting of the text of publicly available bills, amendments, committee hearings, and committee reports, the text of the Congressional

Record, data relating to bill status, data relating to legislative activity, and other similar public information that is directly related to the legislative process.

(c) Pursuant to the plan approved under subsection (d) and consistent with the provisions of any other law, the Library of Congress or the entity designated by that plan shall develop and maintain, in coordination with other appropriate entities of the legislative branch, a single legislative information retrieval system to serve the entire Congress.

(d) The Library shall develop a plan for creation of this system, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the study directed by House Report No. 103-517 to identify and eliminate redundancies in congressional information systems. This plan must be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Library shall provide these committees with regular status reports on the development of the plan.

(e) In formulating its plan, the Library shall examine issues regarding efficient ways to make this information available to the public. This analysis shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives as well as the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives for their consideration and possible action.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$12,428,000, of which \$3,710,000 shall remain available until expended.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$30,307,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed \$130,000: *Provided further*, That funds, not to exceed \$2,000,000, from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional Serial Sets and other related Congressional/non-Congressional publications for 1994 and 1995 to depository and other designated libraries.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 210. The fiscal year 1997 budget submission of the Public Printer to the Congress for the Government Printing Office shall include appropriations requests and recommendations to the Congress that—

(1) are consistent with the strategic plan included in the technological study performed by the Public Printer pursuant to Senate Report 104-114;

(2) assure substantial progress toward maximum use of electronic information dissemination technologies by all departments, agencies, and other entities of the Government with respect to the Depository Library

Program and information dissemination generally; and

(3) are formulated so as to require that any department, agency, or other entity of the Government that does not make such progress shall bear from its own resources the cost of its information dissemination by other than electronic means.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of passenger motor vehicles, not to exceed a fleet of twelve: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316): *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS" and "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 3,800 workyears by the end of fiscal year 1996: *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed \$75,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not to exceed \$7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315); hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries and travel benefits comparable with those which are now or hereafter may be granted single employees of the Agency for International Development, including single Foreign Service personnel assigned to AID projects, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—or his designee—under the authority of section 636(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2396(b));

\$374,406,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$400,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office Building shall be available for use in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 9105 hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office then available and remain available until expended, and not more than \$8,000,000 of such funds shall be available for use in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That to the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, agreements or contracts for the removal of asbestos, and renovation of the building and building systems (including the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system, electrical system and other major building systems) of the General Accounting Office Building may be made for periods not exceeding five years: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 211. (a) Effective June 30, 1996, the functions of the Comptroller General identified in subsection (b) are transferred to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, contingent upon the additional transfer to the Office of Management and Budget of such personnel, budget authority, records, and property of the General Accounting Office relating to such functions as the Comptroller General and the Director jointly determine to be necessary. The Director may delegate any such function, in whole or in part, to any other agency or agencies if the Director determines that such delegation would be cost-effective or otherwise in the public interest, and may transfer to such agency or agencies any personnel, budget authority, records, and property received by the Director pursuant to the preceding sentence that relate to the delegated functions. Personnel transferred pursuant to this provision shall not be separated or reduced in classification or compensation for one year after any such transfer, except for cause.

(b) The following provisions of the United States Code contain the functions to be transferred pursuant to subsection (a): sections 5564 and 5583 of title 5; sections 2312, 2575, 2733, 2734, 2771, 4712, and 9712 of title 10;

sections 1626 and 4195 of title 22; section 420 of title 24; sections 2414 and 2517 of title 28; sections 1304, 3702, 3726, and 3728 of title 31; sections 714 and 715 of title 32; section 554 of title 37; section 5122 of title 38; and section 256a of title 41.

SEC. 212. (a) Section 732 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (h) as follows:

"(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, the Comptroller General shall prescribe regulations for the release of officers and employees of the General Accounting Office in a reduction in force which give due effect to tenure of employment, military preference, performance and/or contributions to the agency's goals and objectives, and length of service. The regulations shall, to the extent deemed feasible by the Comptroller General, be designed to minimize disruption to the Office and to assist in promoting the efficiency of the Office."

SEC. 213. Section 753 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The Board has no authority to issue a stay of any reduction in force action."; and

(3) in the second sentence of subsection (c), as redesignated, by striking "(c)" and inserting "(d)".

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Oversight and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the

head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 306. (a) Upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and in accordance with conditions determined by the Committee on House Oversight, positions in connection with House parking activities and related funding shall be transferred from the appropriation "Architect of the Capitol, Capitol buildings and grounds, House office buildings" to the appropriation "House of Representatives, salaries, officers and employees, Office of the Sergeant at Arms": *Provided*, That the position of Superintendent of Garages shall be subject to authorization in annual appropriations Acts.

(b) For purposes of section 8339(m) of title 5, United States Code, the days of unused sick leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a) shall be included in the total service of such employee in connection with the computation of any annuity under subsections (a) through (e) and (o) of such section.

(c) In the case of days of annual leave to the credit of any such employee as of the date such employee is transferred under subsection (a) the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make a lump sum payment to each such employee for that annual leave. No such payment shall be considered a payment or compensation within the meaning of any law relating to dual compensation.

SEC. 307. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the relocation of the office of any Member of the House of Representatives within the House office buildings.

SEC. 308. (a)(1) Effective October 1, 1995, the unexpended balances of appropriations specified in paragraph (2) are transferred to the appropriation for general expenses of the Capitol Police, to be used for design and installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

(2) The unexpended balances referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the unexpended balance of appropriations for security installations, as referred to in the paragraph under the heading "CAPITOL BUILDINGS", under the general headings "JOINT ITEMS", "ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL", and "CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS" in title I of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995 (108 Stat. 1434), including any unexpended balance from a prior fiscal year and any unexpended balance under such headings in this Act; and

(B) the unexpended balance of the appropriation for an improved security plan, as transferred to the Architect of the Capitol by section 102 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (102 Stat. 2165).

(b) Effective October 1, 1995, the responsibility for design and installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds is transferred from the Architect of the Capitol to the Capitol Police Board. Such design and installation shall be carried out under the direction of the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5). On and after October 1, 1995, any alteration to a structural, mechanical, or architectural feature of the Capitol buildings and grounds that is required for a security system under the preceding sentence may be carried out

only with the approval of the Architect of the Capitol.

(c)(1) Effective October 1, 1995, all positions specified in paragraph (2) and each individual holding any such position (on a permanent basis) immediately before that date, as identified by the Architect of the Capitol, shall be transferred to the Capitol Police.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are those positions which, immediately before October 1, 1995, are—

- (A) under the Architect of the Capitol;
- (B) within the Electronics Engineering Division of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; and
- (C) related to the design or installation of security systems for the Capitol buildings and grounds.

(3) All annual leave and sick leave standing to the credit of an individual immediately before such individual is transferred under paragraph (1) shall be credited to such individual, without adjustment, in the new position of the individual.

SEC. 309. (a) Section 230(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371(a)) is amended by striking out "Administrative Conference of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board".

(b) Section 230(d)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Administrative Conference of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board"; and

(2) by striking out "and shall submit the study and recommendations to the Board".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect only if the Administrative Conference of the United States ceases to exist prior to the completion and submission of the study to the Board as required by section 230 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371).

SEC. 310. Any amount appropriated in this Act for "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Salaries and Expenses—Members' Representational Allowances" shall be available only for fiscal year 1996. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for such fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury, to be used for deficit reduction.

SEC. 311. Section 316 of Public Law 101-302 is amended in the first sentence of subsection (a) by striking "1995" and inserting "1996".

SEC. 312. Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of Public Law 104-1 to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

SEC. 313. (a) The Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives shall have the same law enforcement authority, including the authority to carry firearms, as a member of the Capitol Police. The law enforcement authority under the preceding sentence shall be subject to the requirement that the Sergeant at Arms have the qualifications specified in subsection (b).

(b) The qualifications referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) A minimum of five years of experience as a law enforcement officer before beginning service as the Sergeant at Arms.

(2) Current certification in the use of firearms by the appropriate Federal law enforcement entity or an equivalent non-Federal entity.

(3) Any other firearms qualification required for members of the Capitol Police.

(c) The Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives shall have au-

thority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

SEC. 314. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective September 1, 1995, the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives shall have authority—

(1) to combine the House of Representatives Clerk Hire Allowance, Official Expenses Allowance, and Official Mail Allowance into a single allowance, to be known as the "Members' Representational Allowance"; and

(2) to prescribe regulations relating to allocations, expenditures, and other matters with respect to the Members' Representational Allowance.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

□ 1200

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this bill will take very long, and I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and I can move very quickly through this bill. We have done it before.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has been before the house and had the overwhelming support of the Members of the House. This is the legislative branch appropriations bill. It was passed 305 to 101. There have been no changes in the bill. It is the same bill that we have dealt with before.

The President did veto it, and in his message he said that, "It is, in fact, a disciplined bill . . . one that I would sign under different circumstances," and perhaps at a different time. So, Mr. Speaker, we are sending it back to him in the same form. We think he will sign it, along with other bills.

In fact, he has since signed two appropriations bills, the military construction appropriations bill, the agricultural appropriations bill. The transportation conference report has been passed by the House and is soon to be taken up by the Senate, and several others are pending that will pass that the President, I think, will sign. So, he should sign this bill, and it is really noncontroversial.

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize H.R. 2492 very briefly. It provides budget authority for \$2.18 billion. That is \$433 million below the President's request, a 16.5-percent reduction. It is \$205.7 million below the 1995 level. That is an 8.6-percent reduction in funding from the 1995 levels.

It also reduces staff of the legislative branch by 9.5 percent. The House of Representatives is cut by \$57.2 million. That is a cut below 1995 levels. The committee staff is cut by a third, 33 percent. The House administrative of-

fices have been cut by \$11.9 million and 313 FTE's below 1995 levels.

The joint committees, the printing and economic and taxation committees combined, are cut by 22.8 percent. We have eliminated the Office of Technology Assessment. I know that is controversial, but it does save the Congress and the Government \$22 million. The work of OTA, we feel, is being duplicated by other agencies.

The Architect of the Capitol is cut by \$16.8 million below 1995 levels. It ends the subsidies, the bill ends the subsidies on the flag office. It requests a proposal that will lead to the privatization of the custodial and maintenance work here on Capitol Hill. It creates a panel of outside experts to propose how to privatize the Capitol power plant.

The Government Printing Office is cut by \$7.9 million below 1995 levels. The only increase in the bill is to provide for the digitalization of the collection for the National Digital Library at the Library of Congress.

In summary, it is an excellent bill, reduced significantly from last year's level, an 8.6-percent reduction; one that the President said that he will sign under the proper circumstances. We strongly urge the Members of the Congress, the House, to pass the bill overwhelmingly today.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

The bill before you today, H.R. 2492, is a bill identical to the conference agreement on H.R. 1854, the 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. The house adopted that conference report by a vote of 305 to 101 on September 6, 1995.

H.R. 1854 was returned by the President on October 3, 1995. The veto message of the President said:

(a) "H.R. 1854 is, in fact, a disciplined bill"
(b) "H.R. 1854 is . . . one that I would sign under different circumstances."

The President had absolutely no substantive objections to the bill.

Since then, he has signed two appropriations bills, military construction and agriculture. The conference report on the Transportation has cleared the House and will be taken up soon by the Senate.

Several others are near completion, and we are proceeding in an effort to bring them to the House and to send them to the President in an expeditious manner.

The legislative bill for fiscal year 1996 will greatly reduce the size of our own branch of Government.

To summarize, H.R. 2492 provides budget authority of \$2.18 billion. This is \$433 million below the President's budget request, a 16.5 percent reduction. It is \$205.7 million below fiscal year 1995; that's an 8.6 percent reduction in funding below the current year. It reduces legislative branch jobs [FTE's] by 2,614 under fiscal year 1995—Senate staffing excluded—that's a 9.5 percent reduction in jobs.

There are several provisions included, primarily to facilitate the operations of the House and Senate. The conference report on H.R. 1854 (House Report 104-212) has been available for several weeks and explains these provisions. In the joint explanatory statement,

contained in House Report 104-212, legislative agencies were given directives for carrying out the bill, and we expect that each agency and office covered by this bill will follow those directives. These directives will apply to H.R. 2492 as they did to H.R. 1854.

A few of the highlights of the bill include:

House of Representatives—has been cut \$57.2 million below 1995. Included in this reduction, committee staff have been cut 33 percent; committee budgets have been reduced by \$39.8 million; House administrative offices have been cut by \$11.9 million below 1995; and administrative staff have been reduced by 313 FTE's.

Senate—has been cut \$33.7 million below 1995.

Joint Items—Joint committees—printing, economic, taxation—have been cut by 22.8 percent overall.

Office of Technology Assessment—has been eliminated, an additional \$22 million savings.

Congressional Budget Office—has been given \$1.1 million and 13 more FTE's to perform unfunded mandates workload.

Architect of the Capitol—has been cut \$16.8 million below 1995. The bill ends the taxpayer subsidy to the flag office. Flag prices have been raised to reimburse the cost of the flag raising operation. Requests for proposal will be issued to privatize custodial and maintenance work, and a panel of outside experts will propose how the power plant can be privatized.

Government Printing Office—has been cut \$7.9 million below 1995. Congressional printing has been cut by \$5.6 million, including the elimination of constituent copies of the Congressional Record for Members of the House. The number of daily records printed will be reduced from 16,935 to 10,615, and we have

eliminated free copies of documents to judges, to former Members, to press and other media, and to executive agencies.

Library of Congress—Funding increased \$1.5 million—only increase in bill. The national digital library program of the library is funded at \$3 million, the amount requested.

General Accounting Office—cut \$75 million below 1995. The report indicates our intent to reduce GAO by 25 percent over a 2-year period.

Summary

In summary, the bill is \$205.7 million below fiscal year 1995. It effects a 2,614 reduction in full-time-equivalent jobs; that's a 9.5 percent cut, not including Senate jobs, in total, it is a \$432.8 million reduction below the requests included in the president's budget, a 16.5 percent reduction.

Every member can justify an "aye" vote on passage.

FY 1996 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2492)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS					
SENATE					
Mileage and Expense Allowances					
Mileage of the Vice President and Senators	60,000	60,000	-60,000	-60,000
Expense allowances:					
Vice President	10,000	10,000	10,000
President Pro Tempore of the Senate	10,000	10,000	10,000
Majority Leader of the Senate	10,000	10,000	10,000
Minority Leader of the Senate	10,000	10,000	10,000
Majority Whip of the Senate	5,000	5,000	5,000
Minority Whip of the Senate	5,000	5,000	5,000
Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee	3,000	3,000	3,000
Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, expense allowances	56,000	56,000	56,000
Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders	30,000	30,000	30,000
Total, Mileage and expenses allowances	146,000	146,000	86,000	-60,000	-60,000
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Vice President	1,513,000	1,549,000	1,513,000	-36,000
Office of the President Pro Tempore	457,000	469,000	325,000	-132,000	-144,000
Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders	2,195,000	2,246,000	2,195,000	-51,000
Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips	656,000	672,000	656,000	-16,000
Conference committees	1,992,000	2,040,000	1,992,000	-48,000
Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority	384,000	394,000	380,000	-24,000	-34,000
Policy Committees	1,930,000	+1,930,000	+1,930,000
Office of the Chaplain	192,000	201,000	192,000	-9,000
Office of the Secretary	12,961,000	13,260,000	12,128,000	-833,000	-1,132,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper	32,739,000	35,399,000	31,889,000	-850,000	-3,510,000
Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority	1,197,000	1,225,000	1,047,000	-150,000	-178,000
Agency contributions and related expenses	17,052,000	18,386,000	15,500,000	-1,552,000	-2,886,000
Total, salaries, officers and employees	71,338,000	75,841,000	69,727,000	-1,611,000	-6,114,000
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate					
Salaries and expenses	3,381,000	3,543,500	3,381,000	-162,500
Office of Senate Legal Counsel					
Salaries and expenses	936,000	985,000	936,000	-49,000
Expense Allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate: Expenses allowances					
12,000	12,000	12,000
Contingent Expenses of the Senate					
Senate policy committees	2,574,000	2,672,000	-2,574,000	-2,672,000
Inquiries and investigations	78,112,000	78,863,000	66,395,000	-11,717,000	-12,468,000
Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control	348,000	379,000	305,000	-43,000	-74,000
Secretary of the Senate	1,966,500	1,966,500	1,266,000	-700,500	-700,500
(By transfer)	(7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	74,894,000	72,234,000	61,347,000	-13,547,000	-10,887,000
Miscellaneous items	7,429,000	7,429,000	6,644,000	-785,000	-785,000
Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account	206,542,000	222,663,000	204,029,000	-2,513,000	-18,634,000
Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices	889,000	890,000	778,000	-111,000	-112,000
Settlements and Awards Reserve	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Stationery (revolving fund)	13,000	13,000	13,000
Official Mail Costs					
Expenses	11,000,000	36,300,000	11,000,000	-25,300,000
Total, contingent expenses of the Senate	384,767,500	424,409,500	352,777,000	-31,990,500	-71,632,500
Total, Senate	460,580,500	504,937,000	426,919,000	-33,661,500	-78,018,000
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 1/					
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress					
Gratuities, deceased Members	267,200	-267,200
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker	1,444,000	1,600,000	1,478,000	+34,000	-122,000
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	1,220,784	1,114,000	1,470,000	+249,238	+356,000
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	1,445,413	1,525,000	1,480,000	+34,587	-45,000

1/ Enacted and request reflect current organization of House funding.

FY 1996 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2492)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Office of the Majority Whip	1,121,849	1,357,000	928,000	-193,849	-429,000
Office of the Minority Whip	897,000	946,000	918,000	+21,000	-28,000
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activity	277,000	376,000	376,000	+99,000
House Republican Conference	1,506,587	1,628,000	1,083,000	-423,587	-545,000
House Republican Steering Committee	200,000	205,000	664,000	+464,000	+459,000
Nine minority employees	1,024,000	1,144,000	1,127,000	+103,000	-17,000
House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee	1,153,587	1,226,000	1,181,000	+27,413	-45,000
House Democratic Caucus	553,000	607,000	566,000	+13,000	-41,000
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	10,843,000	11,728,000	11,271,000	+428,000	-457,000
Members' Representational Allowances					
Expenses	351,217,000	389,100,000	380,503,000	+9,288,000	-28,597,000
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations)...	112,805,000	125,749,000	78,629,000	-34,176,000	-47,120,000
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	22,531,000	23,044,000	16,945,000	-5,586,000	-6,099,000
Subtotal, Committee employees	135,336,000	148,793,000	95,574,000	-39,762,000	-53,219,000
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk	15,270,000	16,811,000	13,807,000	-1,463,000	-3,004,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	2,736,000	3,049,000	3,410,000	+674,000	+361,000
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	69,725,000	65,132,000	53,556,000	-16,169,000	-11,576,000
Office of Inspector General	295,000	7,125,000	3,954,000	+3,659,000	-3,171,000
Office of Compliance	2,130,000	858,000	+858,000	-1,272,000
Transfer to Joint Items, Office of Compliance	(-500,000)	(-500,000)	(-500,000)
Office of the Chaplain	124,000	128,000	126,000	+2,000	-2,000
Office of the Parliamentarian	983,000	1,240,000	1,180,000	+197,000	-60,000
Office of the Parliamentarian	(669,000)	(835,000)	(775,000)	(+106,000)	(-60,000)
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives	(314,000)	(405,000)	(405,000)	(+91,000)
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	1,630,000	1,870,000	1,700,000	+70,000	-170,000
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	4,400,000	4,592,000	4,524,000	+124,000	-68,000
Other authorized employees	504,000	675,000	618,000	+114,000	-57,000
Former Speakers' staff	(290,000)	(447,000)	(447,000)	(+157,000)
Technical assistant, Office of the Attending Physician	(161,000)	(171,000)	(171,000)	(+10,000)
Drivers	(53,000)	(57,000)	(-53,000)	(-57,000)
Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees	95,667,000	102,752,000	83,733,000	-11,934,000	-19,019,000
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	3,453,000	2,695,000	1,213,000	-2,240,000	-1,482,000
Official mail (committees, leadership, administrative and legislative offices)	1,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Reemployed annuitants reimbursements	1,279,000	2,451,000	68,000	-1,211,000	-2,383,000
Government contributions	129,895,000	138,698,000	117,541,000	-12,354,000	-21,157,000
Miscellaneous items	778,000	778,000	658,000	-120,000	-120,000
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	135,405,000	144,622,000	120,480,000	-14,925,000	-24,142,000
Total, salaries and expenses	728,468,000	796,995,000	671,561,000	-56,907,000	-125,434,000
Total, House of Representatives	728,735,200	796,995,000	671,561,000	-57,174,200	-125,434,000
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee	4,090,000	4,265,000	3,000,000	-1,090,000	-1,265,000
Joint Committee on Printing	1,370,000	1,414,000	750,000	-620,000	-664,000
Joint Committee on Taxation	6,019,000	6,460,000	5,116,000	-903,000	-1,344,000
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	1,335,000	1,260,000	1,260,000	-75,000
Capitol Police Board					
Capitol Police					
Salaries:					
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives	33,463,000	34,643,000	34,213,000	+750,000	-430,000
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	35,919,000	37,381,000	35,919,000	-1,462,000
Subtotal, salaries	69,382,000	72,024,000	70,132,000	+750,000	-1,892,000
General expenses	2,000,000	2,190,000	2,560,000	+560,000	+370,000
Subtotal, Capitol Police	71,382,000	74,214,000	72,692,000	+1,310,000	-1,522,000
Capitol Guide and Special Services Office	1,991,000	2,093,000	1,991,000	-102,000
Statements of Appropriations	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
Office of Compliance	2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
Transfer from House of Representatives, Office of Compliance	(500,000)	(+500,000)	(+500,000)
Total, Joint items	86,187,000	89,706,000	86,839,000	+652,000	-2,867,000

FY 1996 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2492)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT					
Salaries and expenses.....	21,970,000	23,195,000	3,615,000	-18,355,000	-19,580,000
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	23,188,000	25,788,000	24,288,000	+ 1,100,000	-1,500,000
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Office of the Architect of the Capitol					
Salaries	9,103,000	9,823,000	8,568,000	-534,000	-1,254,000
Travel (limitation on official travel expenses).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)		
Contingent expenses.....	100,000	100,000	100,000		
Subtotal, Office of the Architect of the Capitol.....	9,203,000	9,923,000	8,669,000	-534,000	-1,254,000
Capitol Buildings and Grounds					
Capitol buildings.....	22,797,000	28,085,000	22,882,000	+ 85,000	-5,203,000
Sec. 310 (purchasing x-ray & metal detectors).....	(2,015,000)			(-2,015,000)	
Capitol grounds	5,270,000	6,084,000	5,143,000	-127,000	-941,000
Senate office buildings.....	47,619,000	52,537,000	41,757,000	-5,862,000	-10,780,000
House office buildings.....	41,364,000	46,054,000	33,001,000	-8,363,000	-13,053,000
Capitol Power Plant	36,637,000	41,062,000	35,518,000	-1,119,000	-5,544,000
Offsetting collections	-3,200,000	-3,200,000	-4,000,000	-800,000	-800,000
Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant.....	33,437,000	37,862,000	31,518,000	-1,919,000	-6,344,000
Subtotal, Capitol buildings and grounds	150,487,000	170,622,000	134,301,000	-16,186,000	-36,321,000
Total, Architect of the Capitol	159,690,000	180,545,000	142,970,000	-16,720,000	-37,575,000
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Congressional Research Service					
Salaries and expenses.....	60,084,000	65,913,000	60,084,000		-5,829,000
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Congressional printing and binding.....	89,724,000	91,624,000	83,770,000	-5,954,000	-7,854,000
Total, title I, Congressional Operations	1,630,158,700	1,778,703,000	1,500,046,000	-130,112,700	-278,657,000
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES					
BOTANIC GARDEN					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,230,000	10,370,000	3,053,000	-177,000	-7,317,000
(By transfer).....	(4,000,000)			(-4,000,000)	
Subtotal.....	3,230,000	10,370,000	3,053,000	-177,000	-7,317,000
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses.....	210,164,000	231,580,000	211,664,000	+ 1,500,000	-19,916,000
Authority to spend receipts.....	-7,869,000	-7,869,000	-7,869,000		
Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	202,295,000	223,711,000	203,795,000	+ 1,500,000	-19,916,000
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses.....	27,456,000	32,983,000	30,818,000	+ 3,362,000	-2,165,000
Authority to spend receipts.....	-17,411,000	-19,877,000	-19,830,000	-2,419,000	+ 47,000
Net subtotal, Copyright Office	10,045,000	13,106,000	10,988,000	+ 943,000	-2,118,000
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses.....	44,951,000	47,583,000	44,951,000		-2,632,000
Furniture and furnishings	5,825,000	5,825,000	4,882,000	-943,000	-943,000
Total, Library of Congress (except CRS)	263,116,000	290,225,000	264,616,000	+ 1,500,000	-25,609,000
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Library Buildings and Grounds					
Structural and mechanical care.....	12,483,000	19,929,000	12,428,000	-55,000	-7,501,000
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Office of Superintendent of Documents					
Salaries and expenses.....	32,207,000	30,307,000	30,307,000	-1,900,000	
Revolving fund		15,420,000			-15,420,000
Subtotal, Office of Superintendent of Documents	32,207,000	45,727,000	30,307,000	-1,900,000	-15,420,000

FY 1996 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2492)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	450,360,000	481,060,000	382,806,000	-67,554,000	-98,254,000
Offsetting collections.....	-7,000,000	-8,400,000	-8,400,000	-1,400,000	
Subtotal.....	443,360,000	472,660,000	374,406,000	-68,954,000	-98,254,000
GAO use of collections (formerly receipts).....	6,000,000			-6,000,000	
Total, General Accounting Office.....	449,360,000	472,660,000	374,406,000	-74,954,000	-98,254,000
Total, title II, Other agencies.....	760,396,000	838,911,000	684,810,000	-75,586,000	-154,101,000
Grand total.....	2,390,554,700	2,617,614,000	2,184,856,000	-205,698,700	-432,758,000
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS					
Senate.....	460,580,500	504,937,000	426,919,000	-33,661,500	-78,018,000
House of Representatives.....	728,735,200	796,995,000	671,561,000	-57,174,200	-125,434,000
Joint Items.....	86,187,000	89,706,000	86,839,000	+ 852,000	-2,867,000
Office of Technology Assessment.....	21,970,000	23,195,000	3,615,000	-18,355,000	-19,580,000
Congressional Budget Office.....	23,188,000	25,788,000	24,288,000	+ 1,100,000	-1,500,000
Architect of the Capitol.....	159,690,000	180,545,000	142,970,000	-16,720,000	-37,575,000
Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service.....	60,084,000	65,913,000	60,084,000		-5,829,000
Congressional printing and binding, Government Printing Office.....	89,724,000	91,624,000	83,770,000	-5,954,000	-7,854,000
Total, title I, Congressional operations.....	1,630,158,700	1,778,703,000	1,500,046,000	-130,112,700	-278,657,000
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES					
Botanic Garden.....	3,230,000	10,370,000	3,053,000	-177,000	-7,317,000
Library of Congress (except CRS).....	263,116,000	290,225,000	264,616,000	+ 1,500,000	-25,609,000
Architect of the Capitol (Library buildings and grounds).....	12,483,000	19,929,000	12,428,000	-55,000	-7,501,000
Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding).....	32,207,000	45,727,000	30,307,000	-1,900,000	-15,420,000
General Accounting Office.....	449,360,000	472,660,000	374,406,000	-74,954,000	-98,254,000
Total, title II, Other agencies.....	760,396,000	838,911,000	684,810,000	-75,586,000	-154,101,000
Grand total.....	2,390,554,700	2,617,614,000	2,184,856,000	-205,698,700	-432,758,000
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	52,448,000	92,300,000	32,755,277	-19,692,723	-59,544,723
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	2,443,002,700	2,709,914,000	2,217,611,277	-225,391,423	-492,302,723
Mandatory.....	92,217,200	92,300,000	92,300,000	+ 82,800	
Discretionary.....	2,350,785,500	2,617,614,000	2,125,311,277	-225,474,223	-492,302,723

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a former member of this subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], my friend and the ranking Democrat on this subcommittee, for whom I was very proud to serve when he was chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I have some things that I think need to be said and they need to be said to the Members. I am going to ask the Members that are present to listen to this for a few minutes, because I want to talk about people whose jobs and whose lives are completely, exclusively dependent upon the decisions that we make; not that the Senate and not that the President or anyone else makes. These are people whose jobs and lives are completely dependent upon us.

Mr. Speaker, we are holding hearings over in the Government Operations Committee about a handful of people that served at the pleasure of the President and that the President fired who worked in the travel office. But we have ignored how we have treated our own employees, which in many cases is far worse than anything that the President did to people who worked in the travel office.

One of the first acts that this Congress did was to issue pink slips to all of the nonpartisan employees who work here. These are not people with a legislative or a political agenda. These are the people that deliver our mail and who clean our offices. These are the people who have dedicated their lives to making this great institution and all that it is today.

Mr. Speaker, we have inherited this legacy that they have very carefully and conscientiously established and provided a continuity for the greatness of this institution. They are aware of it; I am not sure how well we are aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks before Christmas, we told these nonpartisan employees that we would not need their services anymore. Since then, the leadership has worked hard to fire as many people as possible.

Mr. Speaker, when this new Congress took over, they hired three dozen people whose principal purpose was to fire as many of our nonpartisan employees as possible, and this bill continues this trend.

The first thing this bill does is to privatize everything it can. And privatization may sound good, Mr. Speaker, but not when it is taken to this extreme. When this bill first came before us, I pointed out how ludicrous it was to privatize the flag office. It was simple to make the flag office self-funding, and thankfully the Senate fixed that part of the bill. Our constituents can still

have a flag flown over the Capitol and it does not cost the taxpayers one dime, and it is a great service and one that they appreciate, oftentimes more than we appreciate it.

Unfortunately, there are many parts of this bill that were not looked at so rationally. First, there is the folding room. The folding room was established because all 435 of our offices need help with their mail. We placed impossible deadlines on these people, and they would often work 12-hour shifts without overtime. Think about that, to serve our needs they worked 12-hour shifts without getting overtime.

Mr. Speaker, we asked them to work in the bowels of our office buildings. No windows, no frills. Ninety percent of these people who served us are minorities and, boy, they worked hard and were dedicated to their job.

Now, we fire them. We eliminated it. And what we have done is to place two big photos and I am sure all of my colleagues have seen it. Apparently, it points up the difference between modernization and the way that things used to be done. It is a before-and-after shot. It shows how nice the office is now. How nice and clean and it is all organized. The before shot shows how messy it was when all these working class people were working every day for our benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the trend continues. The people that work the night shift to clean our offices and enable us to take for granted that the office is going to be clean when we come in the morning, the people that deliver all the mail without fail conscientiously, they all fear the same thing will happen to them and they will.

Mr. Speaker, they are all working people with families. They want to be able to plan for their future, yet their supervisors cannot tell them today if they will have a job next week or if they will be out on the street without health insurance. And even if they are lucky enough to stay on after we privatize them, they will lose their benefits that they have today. They will be given an hourly wage and that is it.

These dedicated employees will be told that we no longer can afford to care if their child is sick or if they have a preexisting medical condition. They are going to be on their own, after spending their lives serving us.

Mr. Speaker, in just another minute I want to tell my colleagues some specifics about what these lives are like. It is important to anybody that is listening to this to focus on it for just a minute.

Mary Ann Wise started off working for our institution as a teenager right after high school. She worked hard. She was promoted. After more than 20 years of dedicated service, she was finally promoted to the chief of office systems management, because no one

else in this institution better understood office systems management.

I do not know if she is a Republican or Democrat. I do not know. I do not think she knows either, but I know she did her job very well. As a reward, my colleagues, we fired her. We just fired her.

Mike Heny's story is much the same. Mike began working here as a junior accountant. He worked hard and a few years ago the Clerk promoted him to chief of finance. Nonpartisan, just doing his job day in and day out. We fired him, too.

John Kostelnick was in charge of property. Things like the desks and the file cabinets in our offices. I want you to listen to this, please. The leadership gave him a quota. They gave John a quota. They told him to put together a list of people to fire. The leadership did not care how good a job his employees did. They just wanted to fire them. Mr. Speaker, John Kostelnick took the high road and he refused, so he had to resign.

For several years now, the voters have been frustrated with the Congress. I would suggest to my colleagues that it is not right that we take this frustration out on the people who have served this institution for most of their adult lives.

I do not think that frustration carries over to those people. People still want to come up and see the Capitol. They want it to be clean and they want it to be well-maintained. They want their Congressperson's office to be well-served, well-outfitted. These are the people that enabled us to be proud of the office that we work in and the institution that we are a part of.

Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest legislative body in the world. It takes more than politicians to make this institution the great symbol of democracy that it is. It takes the dedication and the hard work of ordinary, nonpartisan people. People with families, with working-class incomes, and with a lot of responsibility that they take very seriously for this institution.

Mr. Speaker, we ought not forget what they do for us, what they have done for us throughout their lives, or what they do for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill today.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the reason that I would like to follow up on the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is that many of my colleagues here may live closer. They may not have the same situation that I do, where my constituents have a 6-hour time difference.

Mr. Speaker, I am here in the evenings that the gentleman from Virginia is referring to when the people are at work in these buildings. Some of my colleagues may be out of here.

Maybe they are at the receptions. Maybe they are out with their lobbyist friends. I do not know.

But, Mr. Speaker, I spend a good deal of my time here. I just want to point out before, my Republican colleagues take revenge on us, if they think they are taking revenge on us as politicians when they are firing people who have given their loyalty to this institution, there is a veritable army of people working here all night. They are here all night working. I ask my Republican colleagues, please, do not take out the revenge that they want to have on the Congress or on politicians by firing working people who do their jobs; who have been nothing but loyal to this institution; who are here every night; who do the job every day, the working people that keep the institution going.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we are as sensitive and concerned about the employees of the House and of the agencies of government as anyone. We have got a mandate to downsize government. Every agency of government is being asked to downsize. We cannot downsize government if we do not downsize the number of employees of government.

That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to do it in a sensitive, fair way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], a man who supported the bill last time.

□ 1215

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I took office here in the U.S. Congress in 1991. I have not voted for a legislative appropriations bill until this one. I rise in support, in bipartisan support, with common sense toward supporting this bill, Mr. Speaker.

I think this is a good bill for a number of reasons. There are cuts in this bill, but we can spread the cuts in a fair manner. There are cuts to congressional mail accounts, up to 33 percent of our frank mail account. I believe that that is fair. I think Congress should take the first step in helping us balance the budget.

There are ways by which we can privatize here and some other agencies on the Hill, here in the Washington, DC, area. I think we should be taking those steps as well.

In a bill that I have worked on since I came to Congress in 1991, where I had about 120 Democrats and Republicans cosponsor my legislation, we passed this year, with the support of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], and that was to encourage Members of Congress to save money in their accounts. When we do that, that money can be returned directly to the U.S. Treasury to help reduce the deficit.

I think these are measures we are supporting. I think it is high time that the U.S. Congress does take the first steps toward helping to balance the budget with fair, reasonable, common-sense cuts up here on the Hill.

I support the gentleman's bill in a bipartisan way.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is overwhelmingly politically popular today to talk about downsizing Government and cutting our own employees. I have supported some of the downsizing efforts, including in the legislative branch; and those downsizing efforts have been going on for the past several Congresses, not just in this one. But today I want to talk about something different.

Back in 1992, Montana went from two Members of Congress down to one, me. I am honored to hold that seat.

My colleagues, my staff is not paid enough. My staff is overworked, my staff is overburdened and there are not enough of them; and it is past time that people in a similar situation to mine stand on this floor and say that.

My staff works 9 to 12 hours a day trying to keep up with a quarter of a million more constituents than has the average Member of Congress. A lot of my staff do what I do. They work weekends. My average salary in the staff is \$26,000. In this, one of the highest cost-of-living cities in America, it is not right. It is not fair. They are underpaid, and they are overworked. Like me, they are doing their best to serve Montanans; and they are finding it very difficult because we keep cutting them.

I went from representing 450,000 people to now representing 860,000 people, and my postage account has been cut 40 percent from what it was when I represented half as many people as I do today. It is simply not fair to Montanans.

By the way, this is not just true of my office. All Members who look closely at their staff will find that they are underpaid, that there is great tension, and that there are long hours; and it is not fair.

By the way, it is becoming true not just in our offices but throughout America. Today, an announcement will be made by the Federal Government about the condition of wages, salaries, and benefits of the American worker. The increases in wages, salaries, and benefits last year, the year just concluded, the fiscal year, for the American worker, the increases have never been less since America has been keeping records than they are this year.

Inflation, as low as it is, less than 3 percent, has outstripped wages, sala-

ries, and benefits combined. This cheapening down of the American work force is lowering the standard of living for the American people, and it is just simply wrong.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first comment on the comments of my colleague from Montana. It may well be that the Committee on House Oversight should consider the problem of those few States where the reapportionment brings about an anomaly where one or two or three States perhaps may have populations and one single representative that far exceed the average. It may be that we need to take a tip from the Senate, which does apportion staff related to population, and see how we might accommodate the concerns of the gentleman.

I would be happy to yield to him at this time if he would want to respond.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman in following up my remarks with the indication that perhaps the committee should take a close look at it.

I know that my colleagues on the other side also have Members who represent a good many more people than the average Member of Congress. I would like to yield to the Chairman to see if he could address this anomaly.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that some States are more difficult to administer and to represent. Certainly Alaska is one of them, where they have to have more local congressional offices. The distance, the travel, the ability to service that size of State is a lot different than it is in my district or in many of the districts of the Congress. We are looking at that. I think it is a function of the oversight committee more than it is of the Appropriations Subcommittee, but we think that it must be addressed. We have made a commitment to ourselves to look at this in the coming year so that we can better address the needs of each individual district. But we are still in the mode of downsizing and that means we have to also participate in that process.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their comments.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, concluding on this point, I may just point out that in many cases during a decade, I think the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and mine were both typical of this, our population would almost double just given normal growth rates in certain States. As a result, problems occur in that regard as well.

Mr. PACKARD. If the gentleman will yield further, a few years ago. I had the largest district in population in the Congress, well over 1 million. Now I am down to 500,000. Of course the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS]

has just the opposite. He represented a 500,000 population or less district and now he has moved up because of reapportionment. These are often problems that are difficult to solve on a permanent basis because circumstances change.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman would continue to yield, an important point that I think we are all addressing is this: We are not talking about these funds for ourselves. We are talking about them because they will better serve our constituencies. When you represent close to 900,000 people and take a 40 percent cut in postage and a cut in travel and a cut in personal office expenses, you cannot properly serve your constituents. That is what it is about.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I believe we could consider both the population shifts and the differing geography of larger States when we take up the budget in the formal course of events in the House Oversight Committee and I certainly will bring it to the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS]. Those who may wish to introduce a rule change or legislation should do so and we could use that as the basis upon which we should deliberate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to insert my oars into these waters until I heard the gentleman from Montana speaking. I want to get in on this.

Sure, we work on weekends. We work hard. And many of our people are underpaid. But, Mr. Speaker, that problem exists from boundary to boundary, from border to border, from blue sea to blue sea.

I know many people in my district, and I am sure you all do, too, Republican and Democrat alike, they go to work early in the morning, and they go back home late at night, as my grandma used to say, 12, 14 hours a day.

I do not want anyone listening to our dialog today to believe that we in the Congress have a corner on the market of hard work, or have a corner on the market of working on weekends. We do work hard, and we work harder than most people realize. But so do the people we represent, Mr. Speaker. That is the point I want to drive home and drive it home firmly.

I am afraid that many of us in this body, guilty by association if for no other reason, but this Congress, my friends of the House, has conducted business for the past several years in a reckless, imprudent manner. We have collected \$5 million on the one hand,

spent \$10 million on the other, and then we incredulously wonder why we have problems fiscally and otherwise. It must be corrected. To correct it, I will admit, Mr. Speaker, will impose some pain. But the fiddler must be paid and we have been too lavish and too irresponsible in days gone by. The time to pay that fiddler, I fear, has come now, and we are going to have to do it and we are going to have to recognize others out there share our concern.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], a member of the committee.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, for yielding me the time. I simply wanted to alert him, the distinguished ranking member, and my other colleagues, that at the appropriate time I intend to push for full disclosure of the names of Members of Congress, past and present, as well as House officers, who may have violated House rules or the laws of the United States of America as revealed during the course of the ongoing audit of congressional finances.

As the distinguished subcommittee chairman knows as well as the ranking member, we are now in a second phase of that audit which commenced really at the beginning of this Congress and is being conducted by the House inspector general, John Lainhart, in conjunction with the Price Waterhouse accounting firm. That second phase is designed to report to the House, specifically the House Oversight and Ethics Committees, again the names of those abusers and suspected wrongdoers.

But at this juncture, I would like to ask the subcommittee chairman and the distinguished ranking member to make certain, as I am sure they are, but to make certain that they are aware of some of the irregularities and management problems that have been exposed during the course of that audit and to receive their assurance that they are in fact taking steps to rectify these problems. Specifically the Price Waterhouse audit report listed millions of dollars in waste, fraud and abuse. I am quoting from a Washington Times article last week, October 23, entitled Audit of the House May Lead to Prosecutions.

The audit found that Members of Congress overspent their allowances by \$14 million in fiscal 1994 but covered the excess by reprogramming money from other accounts. Five unnamed lawmakers were singled out for excessive overspending for employee salaries, office expenses and franked mail. Further, lawmakers violated payroll deadline rules by writing 3,400 supplemental paychecks worth \$1.8 million for selected House aides. Another 700 retroactive salary increases worth \$530,000 were made after pay periods ended.

□ 1230

Five million dollars was wasted by the House Information Systems, HIS, to develop an upgraded House financial management system which the auditors and Inspector General Lainhart now say was unsuitable for the House purposes and ineffective, and now which will effectively be junked at a cost of \$5 million.

The auditors went on to find \$900,000 worth of questionable travel reimbursement, where receipts were not provided or other violations of expense rules occurred.

Last, the auditors found 2,200 possibly duplicative travel payments to lawmakers and House aides, 43 cases were double reimbursements were made but no funds returned, resulting in losses of about \$10,000.

So I call the distinguished subcommittee chairman's attention to these abuses, ask him what steps he will be taking.

Mr. PACKARD. If the gentleman will yield, we are aware of the audit. It is an ongoing audit. It has revealed some very interesting and important things for us to take action on. I think the Committee on House Oversight has much more to do with this than the Subcommittee on Appropriations. However, we did appoint, this year our leadership appointed, a House administrative officer. Part of his role is to oversee this activity and make certain the situation is being corrected. Plus over our rules have been improved so this is not happening now, even though it has happened in the past.

Much of the abuse is being corrected through additional rules, and even steps we have taken in our bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, I say I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's recognition of these grave irregularities, and I hope he and the ranking member and others will join with me in my effort to require full disclosure.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me assure my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that my office is working diligently on a regular basis to provide oversight to the auditor general and to Price Waterhouse in the conduct of the second phase of the work that they had embarked on. The period of the audit, of course, was during the period when we had a nonlegislative services director responsible for the administration of the House, part of the reforms we had engaged in in the last Congress.

But I think most importantly I can report that the Washington Times article was really a rehash of what had been in the first series of articles when we brought the raw data to the attention of our colleagues. Subsequently in the further work that Price

Waterhouse has done under Mr. Lainhart's direction, many of the very real concerns that we all shared have been dealt with to the increasing confidence, I think it would be fair to say, of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and myself.

Problems that were more systematic than individual have been identified largely, and while it is not possible for me to comment in any detail now, I certainly look forward to the completion of the second phase so that we can then assure our colleagues, first, of the degree to which there were problems; second, of the steps that we are going to take to help resolve them, and those are mostly systematic changes; and third, that the individuals who remain culpable, who remain, we believe, responsible for some of their actions, who perhaps will need to be dealt with in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, will be properly handled.

There will be no effort on the part of anyone on either side of the aisle to cover up or in any way deny the public the information that is appropriate where we determine, where the auditor general determines, that there have been misuses or malfeasance. There is going to be, I think, however, a great deal of relief on the part of my colleagues and both sides of the aisle, once again, because we will determine, I think, quite properly that the degree to which this sounded like a major scandal in the offering has been vastly overstated.

I am rather optimistic that there will be few individuals who are called before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. But I do think it is an important study of this institution, one that we agreed to do, not just at the beginning of this Congress but in the last Congress when we created the office of auditor itself, and I am looking forward to the improvements that this institution, again in a bipartisan manner, can engage in because it is the only way we can learn from the problems of the past.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. I would like to just engage the gentleman in a brief colloquy, because I find one of the more egregious abuses identified in the audit report to be the \$5 million, give or take, that was spent attempting to create a management information service, of the House Information Systems [HIS], and I am particularly disturbed by the comment attributed to one of our colleagues, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], in the Washington Times article when he is quoted as saying, "Ours was not to reason why. Ours was to get the job done."

But I want to find out, because I genuinely do not know. Apparently the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr.

ROSE] is quoted as saying the House Finance Office was a separate entity, and it directed the computer upgrade as a customer of House Information Systems.

I would like to know exactly where responsibility for making that decision, the House Finance Office does not mean anything to me, where does responsibility lie in making the decision to spend \$5 million on a management information system that was apparently not suited to our needs?

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of Gen. Len Wishart? General Wishart was appointed as the bipartisan administrator of the non-legislative services of the House. Mr. Michel, you have heard of him, Bob Michel, picked him with Foley. The first thing we assigned to General Wishart was the Finance Office.

The audit that you are talking about covers only the period of time when General Wishart, the bipartisan administrator of nonlegislative services, was in charge of the Finance Office. You all have somehow forgotten that in your rewrite of history.

General Wishart made the decision that the Finance Office should proceed with the development of a new financial management system alongside the one that was already in place. You do not go out and buy pocket Quicken like you guys are talking about doing now to run the finances of this place, you understand. He spent \$5 million developing the system. You boys take over and throw it in the street.

Now, I have about had it with using a story about an audit report during a period when your man was in charge of the running of the Finance Office and most of the Clerk's Office.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to conclude my remarks on the purpose we are here for today, and that is the enactment of this legislation.

First of all, let me say that it is a rather unprecedented occurrence that we are participating in. In my view, the President's veto was inappropriate, not because I do not share concerns with some of my colleagues about the final conference report that we adopted on this legislation. As the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] knows, while I did support his bill on passage in the House, I was disappointed at the elimination of OTA and the reductions in the GAO's budget and, therefore, voted against the conference report. But I could not, and did not, counsel the President to veto the legislative branch bill.

In my view, comity between the two branches of government is exceedingly important, and it ought never to be the propensity of the executive branch to

in any sense try to affect the legislative branch budget, whether it be on introduction, as part of the unified budget, or whether it be at the point where we adopt what is in the best interests of both parties and both Houses and send the product on to the President for his signature. I must add parenthetically that it is equally inappropriate to micromanage the budget of the executive office of the President.

Let me simply say I regret the President's action. On the other hand, I must say I wish we had not set it up for him quite so dramatically by sending him only 2 of the 13 regular appropriation bills prior to the beginning of the fiscal year and followed it up in the last month or so with only 1 more, the ag appropriations bill.

We will, I believe, end up with 8 or 9 of the legislative budget products of the Congress, the appropriations bills, signed into law. I hope we will not have a difficult time with a second CR. Hopefully we will sometime be able to agree on all 13 of them and have our budget in place, and when we send this bill down as part of a package, I hope it will be signed, even though I may personally disagree with some of the decisions we have made in this conference report.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for a very difficult task well done. This bill is never easy for anyone, and as I have said several times, I simply wanted to be as good a ranking member for the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] as the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] were for me during the years I chaired this committee.

But there are problems that need to be addressed, and I hope we will continue to address them both in the Committee on House Oversight and in the appropriations bill for the next fiscal year, as relates to a number of activities that we are engaged in here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I will place the remainder of my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative situation for this bill—the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996—has changed considerably since we passed the conference report on September 6.

A veto by the President was an unprecedented occurrence during my tenure in Congress.

So we are blazing new trails here in considering this bill for a second time.

President Clinton said he'd veto the bill for congressional operations if we sent it to him as one of the first appropriations bills. We did—and he did.

It is not advice I gave him. As the Members of the House know, vetoing the legislative branch bill was a historic first. It was never done during my 14-year tenure as chairman of this appropriations subcommittee.

I'm troubled that the time-honored tradition that Congress governs its own affairs without

interference from the Executive has been breached.

I believe there is also a solid separation of powers argument against the President's veto as well.

But Congress also has a responsibility to make progress on appropriations bills.

The President is likely to sign most of the 13 regular appropriations bills.

But the President received only 2 of our regular 13 appropriations bills prior to the beginning of the fiscal year on October 1.

The Agriculture appropriations bill is the only appropriations bill we have sent to the President since September 26—over 4 weeks.

By not getting our work on the appropriations bills done, we've left ourselves vulnerable to the President's argument that we shouldn't be taking care of ourselves first.

So I'm pleased to see the ambitious House schedule for consideration of appropriations bills this week, and I hope we can show the President that we will do the people's business as well as our own.

I understand that H.R. 2492—with the exception of several technical corrections—is identical to the provisions of the House- and Senate-passed conference report for H.R. 1854, the bill vetoed by the President.

I signed the conference report on H.R. 1854 as a courtesy to Chairman PACKARD. RON PACKARD has done a good job under difficult circumstances during his maiden voyage as chairman.

But I opposed the conference report on the House floor for two major reasons: the elimination of the Office of Technology Assessment—which the House had voted to continue—and the cuts to the General Accounting Office of greater than 15 percent, far greater than the reductions in the House-passed bill.

I intend to oppose H.R. 2492 today because these provisions remain the same. I am also disappointed because—once more—we have missed a golden opportunity to enact lobby and gift reform.

In other ways, the conference report was an improvement upon the original House-passed bill: \$1.1 million was added for the Congressional Budget Office over the House committee recommendation—more important, we added 13 positions at CBO to cope with their new duties relative to analyzing unfunded mandates.

We restored cuts made to personnel at the Government Printing Office—we brought FTE's to 3,800, an additional 250 over the House level.

We restored funds for the depository library program. It's a good idea to move into the electronic age but the House bill attempted to force everyone to do it overnight.

We restored the Joint Committee on Printing. The Joint Committee has been an efficient method of overseeing printing operations; a divided operation between the House Oversight and Senate Rules Committees would have been a major change with unknown results.

We restored the Folklife Center at the Library and restored funding at the Library of Congress which had been temporarily earmarked for OTA. Neither was a real target for cuts, and the conference demonstrated that by restoring funds to both.

We kept the Flag Office alive; however, the cost of flags will rise to cover the costs of operating the Flag Office.

So there were some improvements to the House version of the bill. However, the shut-down of the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA] was particularly thoughtless. That action has been criticized around the country and in the international community.

But I'm reluctant to open the OTA issue at this late date.

OTA is resigned to their fate. Under the circumstances, the conference committee made generous provisions for OTA's closeout, and as a result, their closeout has been a model of professionalism.

OTA's many specialists have been finalizing reports at breakneck speed and a skeleton staff will be available until early next year to complete reports and provide for orderly close-down and orderly disposition of equipment and records.

OTA's professional closeout is just one more example of the caliber of the agency we are abolishing and the big mistake we are making.

In short, this bill is an improvement upon the original House-passed bill, but I will oppose it for the reasons I've outlined.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will just make a conclusion remark.

I want to take this time to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for the gentle way in which he operates here. I truly enjoy working with him. All of the members of the subcommittee I have appreciated working with. They have all been very helpful in crafting this bill.

It is a good bill. Three hundred and five Members voted for it last time. I fully expect that more will vote for it this time. It is a good bill. It needs to go to the President and be signed.

If the entire Federal budget followed the model of our bill, we would balance the budget in 1 year and still have a small surplus left over. That is the model we have given to the Members of this body, and we hope that they will accept it as a good model, one that they can support and vote for, and I want to again thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for the privilege of working with him on this issue in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to House Resolution 239, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7, rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 106, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 747]

YEAS—315

Ackerman	Fields (TX)	Manton
Allard	Flanagan	Manzullo
Archer	Foley	Martini
Army	Forbes	Mascara
Bachus	Fowler	McCarthy
Baessler	Fox	McCollum
Baker (CA)	Franks (CT)	McCrery
Baker (LA)	Franks (NJ)	McDade
Baldacci	Frelinghuysen	McDermott
Ballenger	Frisa	McHale
Barcia	Frost	McHugh
Barr	Funderburk	McInnis
Barrett (NE)	Furse	McIntosh
Barrett (WI)	Galleghy	McKeon
Bartlett	Ganske	McNulty
Barton	Gekas	Meehan
Bass	Geren	Metcalfe
Bateman	Gilchrest	Meyers
Bentsen	Gillmor	Mica
Bereuter	Gilman	Miller (CA)
Bilbray	Gonzalez	Miller (FL)
Billirakis	Goodlatte	Molinar
Bishop	Goodling	Mollohan
Bliley	Gordon	Montgomery
Blute	Goss	Moorhead
Boehliert	Graham	Morella
Bonilla	Greenwood	Murtha
Bono	Gunderson	Myers
Borski	Gutknecht	Myrick
Boucher	Hall (OH)	Nethercutt
Brewster	Hall (TX)	Neumann
Brown (FL)	Hamilton	Ney
Brown (OH)	Hancock	Norwood
Brownback	Hansen	Nussle
Bryant (TN)	Hastert	Obey
Bunn	Hastings (WA)	Ortiz
Bunning	Hayes	Orton
Burr	Hayworth	Oxley
Burton	Hefley	Packard
Buyer	Heineman	Parker
Callahan	Herger	Paxon
Calvert	Hilleary	Payne (VA)
Camp	Hobson	Peterson (FL)
Canady	Hoekstra	Petri
Cardin	Hoke	Pickett
Castle	Holden	Pombo
Chabot	Horn	Pomeroy
Chambliss	Hostettler	Porter
Chapman	Houghton	Portman
Chenoweth	Hunter	Poshard
Christensen	Hutchinson	Pryce
Chrysler	Hyde	Quillen
Clayton	Inglis	Quinn
Clement	Istook	Radanovich
Clinger	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Coble	Jefferson	Reed
Coburn	Johnson (CT)	Regula
Collins (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Riggs
Cooley	Jones	Rivers
Costello	Kanjorski	Roberts
Cox	Kasich	Roemer
Cramer	Kelly	Rogers
Crane	Kennedy (RI)	Rohrabacher
Crapo	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Creameans	Kim	Roth
Cubin	King	Roukema
Cunningham	Kingston	Royce
Danner	Kieccka	Sabo
Davis	Klug	Salmon
Deal	Knollenberg	Sawyer
DeFazio	Kolbe	Saxton
DeLay	LaHood	Scarborough
Deutsch	Lantos	Schaefer
Diaz-Balart	Largent	Schiff
Dickey	Latham	Schumer
Dixon	LaTourette	Scott
Dooley	Laughlin	Seastrand
Doolittle	Lazio	Sensenbrenner
Dornan	Leach	Shadegg
Doyle	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Duncan	Lightfoot	Shuster
Dunn	Lincoln	Skeen
Edwards	Linder	Skelton
Ehlers	Lipinski	Smith (MI)
Ehrlich	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
English	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Ensign	Longley	Solomon
Everett	Lucas	Souder
Ewing	Luther	Spence
Fawell	Maloney	Spratt

Stark	Thornberry	Whitfield
Stearns	Torkildsen	Wicker
Stockman	Traffant	Williams
Stump	Upton	Wilson
Stupak	Visclosky	Wise
Talent	Vucanovich	Wolf
Tanner	Walker	Woolsey
Tate	Walsh	Wynn
Taylor (MS)	Wamp	Young (AK)
Taylor (NC)	Watts (OK)	Young (FL)
Tejeda	Weldon (FL)	Zeliff
Thomas	Weller	Zimmer

NAYS—106

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Pallone
Andrews	Gephardt	Pastor
Becerra	Gibbons	Payne (NJ)
Bellenson	Green	Pelosi
Berman	Gutierrez	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Harman	Rahall
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Rangel
Browder	Hefner	Rose
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Hinchee	Rush
Clay	Hoyer	Sanders
Clyburn	Jacobs	Sanford
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Skaggs
Condit	Kennedy (MA)	Slaughter
Conyers	Kennelly	Stenholm
Coyne	Klink	Stokes
de la Garza	LaFalce	Studds
DeLauro	Levin	Thompson
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Thornton
Dicks	Lowey	Thurman
Dingell	Markey	Torres
Doggett	Martinez	Torricelli
Durbin	Matsui	Towns
Engel	McKinney	Velazquez
Eshoo	Meek	Vento
Evans	Menendez	Volkmer
Farr	Minge	Ward
Fattah	Mink	Waters
Fazio	Moran	Watt (NC)
Filner	Nadler	Waxman
Flake	Neal	Wyden
Foglietta	Oberstar	Yates
Ford	Oliver	
Frank (MA)	Owens	

NOT VOTING—11

Boehner	Sisisky	Waldholtz
Fields (LA)	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)
Mfume	Tiahrt	White
Moakley	Tucker	

□ 1303

Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BEILENSEN, and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1905, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 248

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the con-

ference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1905, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, only 2 of the 13 appropriations bills have been signed into law, and we need to expedite consideration of these measures as they are reported from conference.

Chairman JOHN MYERS and ranking member TOM BEVILL and the rest of the conferees did an excellent job, as always. They worked closely with the authorizing committees, and have brought forth a balanced bill which is \$707 million below the fiscal year 1995 level.

I'm particularly pleased that sufficient funds were made available for the Tennessee Valley Authority, which provides important services for the 7-State region which makes up the Tennessee Valley area. These TVA functions would otherwise have to be provided by the Corps of Engineers or some other Federal agency, which would be more costly in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of only a few appropriations bills that the President is expected to sign rather than veto, so I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and pass this conference report without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding the customary one-half hour of debate time to me, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we do not oppose this rule. The majority seems now to have accepted as standard practice, rules such as this one waiving all points of order against conference reports for appropriations bills, and against their consideration.

The conferees' resolution of the disagreements in this legislation were made in such a manner that we understand the President is almost certain to sign the bill into law. That is good news for this appropriations bill, at least.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with some major environmental, energy and natural resource issues, and many Members are especially concerned about the clear shift in direction that

is reflected in the funding priorities in these areas.

For example, the bill makes deep cuts in research and development budgets for solar and other renewable energy sources. Those accounts would be cut by 29 percent from the current level.

These energy sources are essential to helping our Nation reach several very important goals, including reducing the trade deficit, curbing gas emissions and air pollution from energy use, and reducing our Nation's dependence on imported oil—much of which comes from the politically volatile Middle East. The large cut in spending for development of these resources will mean a greatly reduced commitment to achieving these goals, which is troubling, to be frank about it, Mr. Speaker, to many of us.

Meanwhile, funding for Army Corps of Engineers' water projects is reduced by only 6 percent. Not only is that a relatively small cut compared to that provided for renewable energy resources, it is very small compared to the reductions that are being applied this year to many other valuable domestic programs—for example, the one-third reduction in spending that would be applied to the Environmental Protection Agency under the House-passed VA-HUD appropriations bill. If this appropriations bill is viewed in the context of all the other budget decisions the House is making this year, the high priority that the majority has placed on protecting water projects really ought to be questioned.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat, we do not oppose this rule, and we urge our colleagues to approve it so that we may proceed to consideration of the conference report for the energy and water appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend and colleague from Tennessee that we have no requests for time on our side and, pending his ending on his side, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], a valuable member of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee Yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 248, a rule which waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1905, the energy and water development appropriations for fiscal year 1996. I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this rule, and I want to briefly discuss section 507 of the conference report.

Section 507 provides that "[i]n order to ensure the timely implementation of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to

proceed without delay with construction of those facilities in conformance with the final Biological Opinion for the Animas-La Plata project, Colorado and New Mexico, dated October 25, 1991." This language does not seek to waive environmental requirements. However, the conference came to the judgment that this project has already more than satisfied environmental requirements. For example, two separate biological opinions under the Endangered Species Act have been completed. One section 404(r) permit exemption under the Clean Water Act was granted. Furthermore, an environmental impact statement and supplemental draft environmental impact statement under NEPA have occurred, and there are still more reviews currently underway.

This project has been the subject of lengthy environmental consideration, and we are simply saying, Enough is enough. It is time to move forward.

The simple fact is that the construction of the Animas-La Plata project must begin immediately in order to possibly meet the terms of the 1986 settlement agreement between two tribes of native Americans, the United States, and other parties. If the two Ute tribes do not begin receiving water by January 1, 2001, then they have an option until January 1, 2005, to reject water from the Animas-La Plata Project and to institute litigation to obtain direct flow rights to the water with a 100-year-old priority date. That litigation will have a severe economic impact on the rural and urban economies of Colorado and New Mexico, jeopardize the water rights of countless of people throughout the Four Corners region, and cost the U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars. This Congress cannot want to see further litigation and we do not want to break our word to these native Americans. That is why section 507 was included.

Second, a question may arise as to what the conferees meant by the words "timely implementation" and "without delay" is simple. Timely implementation means, right now. That is why they choose the words, "without delay." They could have said, without one year's delay. They could have said, without undue delay. Instead, they chose the unambiguous, without delay. The Secretary should have no trouble interpreting this unambiguous language.

I reiterate that this is primarily an issue of fair dealing with native Americans. Nearly 125 years ago the United States promised these two tribes water to make their reservations a homeland. In 1988 Congress reaffirmed that promise and, in return for this promise, the tribes set aside their most valuable tribal asset—their senior water rights in exchange for the promised project. They in good faith agreed not to seek to take water away from their non-Indian neighbors, but instead to share

water with them. Congress now must ensure that the United States lives up to its end of the deal.

The Secretary of Interior has the responsibility under the 1988 legislation to build the Animas-La Plata project. In hearings on the fiscal year 1994 Energy and water development appropriations bill, Secretary Babbitt stated: "I understand that Congress has mandated that this project get going, and I will comply with that mandate."

The Secretary now has yet another mandate from the Congress. Section 507 provides him with the necessary tools to move forward and build this project in accordance with obvious congressional intent. I urge Secretary Babbitt to move forward and build the Animas-La Plata project immediately so that the United States may preserve the integrity of the water rights settlement.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following:

A-LP FOES ARE ALL WET

It's been suggested in some quarters of late that supporters of the Animas-La Plata water project near Durango are trying to slip something past the public and the Congress. What hogwash.

In reality, the efforts under way this month are aimed at keeping on track a project that was long-ago approved—and has subsequently been re-approved—by Congress, by the states of Colorado and New Mexico, by voters in the local water district and by two Ute Indian tribes.

Environmental groups, led by the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, continue to work behind the scenes and in court to halt a project that has been legitimately approved by both houses of Congress and signed into law as a treaty obligation to Colorado's long-suffering native Indian tribes.

The current debate, like much that has surrounded the Animas-La Plata since it was authorized by Congress in 1968, is filled with misinformation and half-truths.

For example, one Front Range newspaper said that before Congress approves the project it must be certain that it isn't adding to the list of broken promises to the Indians.

There are several things wrong with that. First is the fact that Congress has already approved the project, initially when it was authorized in 1968; later, through annual appropriations bills; and most importantly, when it adopted the 1988 Indian Water Rights Settlement Act.

Secondly, the 1988 act wasn't approved only by Congress, but by the states of Colorado and New Mexico, and by the Ute Mountain Utes and Southern Ute Indian Tribes. Essential to that act is the construction of the Animas-La Plata to provide water to the Indian tribes, a provision the Indians accepted in return for dropping their long-standing claims under the Winters Doctrine to water in rivers of the region.

If Animas-La Plata isn't built by the deadlines set in that agreement, the Indians are free to go back to court and win a much more costly settlement from the U.S. government. But the Indians have said repeatedly that they want the water the project will provide, not a prolonged court battle.

Much is also made of the fact the Animas-La Plata will be built in two phases, and

there is no guarantee the second phase, which won't have federal involvement, will ever be constructed. Therefore, critics charge, there is no guarantee the Indians will get the water due them from the project.

But the Indians will receive 60,000 acre feet of water from Phase 1 of the Animas-La Plata project, no small amount of water currency. (It's instructive to note that when critics talk about the cost of the Animas-La Plata, they use the most recent figures for both Phase 1 and Phase 2, approximately \$710 million, not the roughly \$525 million for Phase 1. But when they talk about the benefits of the project, they only mention Phase 1.)

In 1991, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acknowledged that the primary features of the project could be constructed with no threat to the endangered Colorado squawfish and issued a final biological opinion stating as much. The sufficiency language now proposed in Congress would simply require construction of what was allowed under that opinion.

However, the 1991 opinion was a disappointment to Sierra Club officials, who have vowed to keep the project tied up in litigation for 40 years. They immediately filed a lawsuit claiming the project violated the National Environmental Policy Act on the grounds that "all reasonable and prudent alternatives" to the project were not adequately examined. Unfortunately, the Sierra Club got a federal judge to agree, forcing the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to halt its construction plans and file a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. That supplement is expected to be completed later this year.

This project has had agonizing environmental examination, as well as broad-based official approval. Congress should adopt the language in the appropriations bill and allow the project to proceed.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, which I support, gives evidence of how well our conference system works. Many times, as in this case in title IV, the House which provided no moneys, shall we say, for the Delaware River Basin Commission or the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, an ongoing independent agency, in both cases the Senate, in its wisdom, did something different. Then the conference, in its own type of wisdom, was able to strike a compromise and bring in amounts of money that reflect the desire of the Congress to continue the operation of some of these independent agencies, albeit with a warning that in years to come more and more responsibility for their activities will have to be placed within their own bailiwicks in their local governments.

□ 1315

In the compact types of commissions like the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, they will, in due time, be able to reconstruct their funding streams in such a way that they will be

able to continue their activities well. They could not do it, though, with a zeroing out of their funding for this particular year.

Hence, the conference saved the ongoing stream of funding for the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, but at a lower level. The conference has worked. The people's will has been met through the work of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1905, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 248, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1905), making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered as having been read. (For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of October 26, 1995, at page H10913.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on July 12 of this year, the House passed H.R. 1905, and on August 1, the Senate passed similar legislation.

Mr. Speaker, after the August recess, our conferees, from both the House and Senate, started working through September and most of October trying to work out the differences in the bills between the two bodies.

The major difference was that the Senate had about a billion and a half more 602(b) allocation than the House had to work with. We had a reallocation, but we still had some problems about the priorities of what programs we would fund and at what figure.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have worked diligently, and for this I thank the members of the conference and the staff who have been working almost daily since the middle of September trying to resolve the differences. We thank all of them and, again, I thank particularly the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]. The gentleman and I have worked together for almost 30 years now, most of which have been on this subcommittee and under the chairmanship of the gentleman. More recently, under my chairmanship, we have continued to work together closely.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is \$19.3 billion, which is \$654 million more than the House-passed version; however, it is \$833 million less than the Senate. The important thing is that the bill is \$707 million below the level appropriated for 1995.

Mr. Speaker, we have moved in the right direction. The conference report is \$1.23 billion less than the President requested. This is the lowest appropriations for energy and water since 1990. We are heading in the right direction.

We have downsized Government. We have made some significant reductions. We have 35 programs that we have terminated. As has been mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], we have a few other programs that we intend to terminate next year, but we are giving warning that we just cannot continue to fund some of the responsibilities that rightfully could be the States', and should be the States', or that should not be funded at all.

Mr. Speaker, in no instance did an agency or department funded by this energy and water bill receive appropriations exceeding last year's level. The one exception is in defense. The nondefense discretionary amount is \$8.7 billion, which is a 13 percent reduction from last year.

In those reductions, we reduced the Corps of Engineers by \$138 million from last year's level. The Bureau of Reclamation has been reduced by \$31 million from last year's level. The Department of Energy, including defense, has been reduced by \$173 million. ARC, the Appalachian Regional Commission, has been reduced by \$102 million.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] mentioned the Tennessee Valley Authority. We reduced that by \$29 million. The Federal Energy Regu-

latory Commission is reduced by \$35 million. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission was reduced by \$52 million. This is to mention just a few of the significant reductions that we did make.

However, we did increase defense spending. A lot of my colleagues do not realize that a large amount of our funding is in defense. Nearly 60 percent of our bill is defense. Most of it, of course, is in the nuclear side of defense.

Mr. Speaker, we have a 16-percent cut in DOE administrative costs with the exception of defense. We require the Department of Energy to reduce its support contracts by 50 percent. It is shocking to see how many employees they have. DOE has many more contract employees doing various types of work than they have of their own departmental employees.

Defense spending is \$10.6 billion. That is a \$550 million increase from last year, all in defense. We have increased defense cleanup, environmental restoration and waste management. Last year we appropriated \$4.9 billion, and this year we have included \$5.556 billion, which is an increase of 13.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only dramatic increase that we have in our bill. It is the one area where we were probably a little bit more generous than we should have been. We recognize that there are some defense production sites in this country where there is a clean-up job to be done. But DOE has done a miserable job of cleaning up most of these sites.

Mr. Speaker, they have been wasting money. More people and more money is just not the answer. We have somewhat of an agreement with the Senate that we are going to manage this a little bit better. We will have to help the DOE with some changes in legislation to help them do a better job, because there is an enormous job to be done here.

We recognize that this bill is larger than the House passed bill. We have made some significant reductions that I have not mentioned. Reductions in fusion are larger than some people would have liked. I am sure we are going to hear about the reduction we made in solar. But we have no choice but to make these reductions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is not the bill that many of us would have liked to have seen, but it is a bill that I think we all can live with. I urge that all my colleagues support the conference report.

Again, I thank those staff and members of the conference who struggled since August to get to this point today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 1905, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 1905 is in my judgment, balanced and fair. It

FY 1996 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1905)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
General investigations.....	171,196,000	155,625,000	129,906,000	126,323,000	121,767,000	-49,432,000
Construction, general.....	923,668,000	785,125,000	807,846,000	778,456,000	804,573,000	-119,065,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.....	328,138,000	319,250,000	307,885,000	307,885,000	307,885,000	-20,253,000
Operation and maintenance, general.....	1,646,535,000	1,749,875,000	1,712,123,000	1,696,998,000	1,703,697,000	+57,162,000
Regulatory program.....	101,000,000	112,000,000	101,000,000	101,000,000	101,000,000	
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	14,979,000	20,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-4,979,000
General expenses.....	152,500,000	164,725,000	150,000,000	153,000,000	151,500,000	-1,000,000
Oil spill research.....	900,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	-50,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil.....	3,338,919,000	3,307,450,000	3,219,810,000	3,174,512,000	3,201,272,000	-137,647,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Central Utah Project Completion Account						
Central Utah project construction.....	22,839,000	18,905,000	18,905,000	18,905,000	18,905,000	-3,934,000
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	11,133,000	18,503,000	18,503,000	18,503,000	18,503,000	+7,370,000
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account.....	5,000,000	5,485,000	5,485,000	5,485,000	5,485,000	+485,000
Program oversight and administration.....	1,191,000	1,246,000	1,246,000	1,246,000	1,246,000	+55,000
Total, Central Utah project completion account.....	40,163,000	44,139,000	44,139,000	44,139,000	44,139,000	+3,976,000
Bureau of Reclamation						
General investigations.....	14,190,000	13,602,000	13,114,000	11,234,000	12,884,000	-1,508,000
Construction program.....	432,727,000	375,943,000	417,301,000	390,461,000	411,046,000	-21,661,000
Operation and maintenance.....	274,300,000	288,759,000	278,759,000	267,393,000	273,076,000	-1,224,000
Loan program.....	9,800,000	16,668,000	11,668,000	11,668,000	11,668,000	+2,068,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(23,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(+14,000,000)
General administrative expenses.....	54,034,000	50,327,000	48,150,000	48,150,000	48,150,000	-5,884,000
Emergency fund.....	1,000,000					-1,000,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority).....	(-7,472,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(+2,916,000)
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	45,385,000	43,579,000	43,579,000	43,579,000	43,579,000	-1,806,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	831,236,000	788,878,000	812,571,000	772,485,000	800,203,000	-31,033,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	871,399,000	833,017,000	856,710,000	816,624,000	844,342,000	-27,057,000
(By transfer).....	(-7,472,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(+2,916,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities.....	3,240,548,000	3,355,521,000	2,575,700,000	2,830,324,000	2,727,407,000	-513,141,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities.....	73,210,000	75,441,000	84,197,000	84,197,000	84,197,000	-9,013,000
Gross revenues.....	-9,900,000	-34,903,000	-34,903,000	-34,903,000	-34,903,000	-25,003,000
Net appropriation.....	63,310,000	40,538,000	29,294,000	29,294,000	29,294,000	-34,016,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.....	301,327,000	288,807,000	278,807,000	278,807,000	278,807,000	-22,520,000
General Science and Research Activities.....	984,031,000	1,011,699,000	991,000,000	971,000,000	981,000,000	-3,031,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund.....	392,800,000		226,599,000	151,600,000	151,600,000	-241,200,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:						
Defense function.....	(4,892,691,000)	(5,986,736,000)	(5,265,478,000)	(5,989,750,000)	(5,557,532,000)	(+664,841,000)
Non-defense function.....	(1,045,368,000)	(991,063,000)	(905,348,000)	(906,413,000)	(900,348,000)	(-145,020,000)
Total.....	(5,938,059,000)	(6,977,799,000)	(6,170,826,000)	(6,896,163,000)	(6,457,880,000)	(+519,821,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
Weapons Activities.....	3,229,069,000	3,469,367,000	3,273,014,000	3,751,719,000	3,460,314,000	+231,245,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management.....	4,892,691,000	5,986,736,000	5,265,478,000	5,989,750,000	5,557,532,000	+664,841,000
Other Defense Activities.....	1,834,657,000	1,423,127,000	1,323,841,000	1,439,112,000	1,373,212,000	-461,445,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal.....	129,430,000	198,053,000	198,400,000	248,400,000	248,400,000	+118,970,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....	10,085,847,000	11,087,283,000	10,080,733,000	11,428,981,000	10,839,458,000	+553,811,000
Departmental Administration.....	387,312,000	423,135,000	362,250,000	352,126,000	366,697,000	-20,615,000
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-161,490,000	-137,306,000	-122,306,000	-137,306,000	-122,306,000	+39,184,000
Net appropriation.....	225,822,000	285,829,000	239,944,000	214,820,000	244,391,000	+18,569,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	26,465,000	30,896,000	26,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-1,465,000
Power Marketing Administrations						
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration.....	6,494,000	4,260,000	4,260,000	4,260,000	4,260,000	-2,234,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.....	22,431,000	19,829,000	19,843,000	19,843,000	19,843,000	-2,588,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.....	21,316,000	29,636,000	29,778,000	29,778,000	29,778,000	+8,462,000

FY 1996 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1905) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....	192,285,000	282,758,000	257,852,000	257,852,000	257,852,000	+85,367,000
(By transfer, permanent authority).....	(7,472,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(-2,916,000)
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund.....		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....	242,526,000	337,484,000	312,533,000	312,533,000	312,533,000	+70,007,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	166,173,000	136,567,000	132,290,000	131,290,000	131,290,000	-34,883,000
Revenues Applied.....	-166,173,000	-136,567,000	-132,290,000	-131,290,000	-131,290,000	+34,883,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy.....	15,562,676,000	16,447,857,000	14,740,610,000	16,242,358,000	15,389,490,000	-173,186,000
(By transfer).....	(7,472,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(-2,916,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	272,000,000	183,000,000	142,000,000	182,000,000	170,000,000	-102,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	17,833,000	18,500,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	-833,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses.....	343,000	353,000		440,000	343,000	
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission.....	478,000	551,000		478,000	428,000	-50,000
Total.....	821,000	904,000		918,000	771,000	-50,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:						
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	511,000	524,000		511,000	511,000	
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:						
Salaries and expenses.....	520,501,000	520,300,000	468,300,000	474,300,000	468,300,000	-52,201,000
Revenues.....	-498,501,000	-498,300,000	-457,300,000	-457,300,000	-457,300,000	+41,201,000
Subtotal.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	17,000,000	11,000,000	-11,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....	5,080,000	5,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-80,000
Revenues.....	-5,080,000	-5,500,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	+80,000
Subtotal.....						
Total.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	17,000,000	11,000,000	-11,000,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....	2,664,000	2,970,000	2,531,000	2,664,000	2,531,000	-133,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses.....	318,000	332,000		280,000	318,000	
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission.....	288,000	380,000		288,000	250,000	-38,000
Total.....	606,000	692,000		568,000	568,000	-38,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund...	137,873,000	140,473,000	103,338,000	110,339,000	106,169,000	-28,704,000
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator.....	1,000,000					-1,000,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies.....	455,408,000	368,063,000	275,870,000	331,000,000	311,550,000	-143,858,000
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-185,403,000	-395,343,000	-410,343,000	-395,343,000	-410,343,000	-224,940,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	20,042,998,000	20,562,044,000	18,882,457,000	20,169,152,000	19,336,311,000	-706,688,000
(By transfer).....						

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not pay a special tribute to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Honorable TOM BEVILL. Mr. BEVILL is one of the true gentlemen of the House who enjoys the respect and admiration of all his colleagues. I am particularly grateful that I had the opportunity to benefit from his counsel, his wisdom, and his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to vote "aye" on the conference report on H.R. 1905.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill today, and I recommend the approval of this bill.

This bill, when it passed the House, received the biggest vote that this particular bill has ever received in its history. And the vote was 400 to something like 23, I believe. I want to certainly commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], my colleague of many years and my friend. We have worked together for many years on this particular committee. This is the gentleman's first time to present this bill as chairman. I want to commend the gentleman. He has done a great job. He has been great to work with. We both recommend this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is really a non-partisan bill. We are in agreement that

we have to cut the size of our Federal Government. We are in agreement that we have to cut the spending and get our country back on a sound financial basis.

With that in mind, 2 years ago this bill contained \$22 billion. This year, it is \$19.3 billion. So, the difference there is more than a \$2 billion difference.

Mr. Speaker, I present this bill to you, with the reduction that has been made. As a matter of fact, since the 1994 bill, that amounts to 13-percent below the 1994 appropriation bill. It is 6-percent less than what the President requested.

Mr. Speaker, we have had to make some tough choices, but I want to say we recommend this bill to our colleagues as certainly reasonable under

no science or no research to be found in that \$40 million.

That is how we are saving money in order to make sure we balance the budget while at the same time preserving the basic scientific research programs on which this country depends.

The priorities in this bill are the priorities that the House endorsed in passing both the authorization and appropriation bills. Should we be completely satisfied? No, we should not be completely satisfied. Of course not. A conference report is, by definition, a compromise.

But this bill is a down payment on a balanced budget that we will have in 7 years. Basically, we are keeping our promises to the American people. We accomplish this without sacrificing our core scientific programs by cutting out the frills and the nonessentials.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Again, I congratulate the ranking member as well as the chairman of this committee for the hard work and good work they have done and the leadership they have provided.

□ 1345

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the ranking member for the time and Chairman MYERS for entering into this colloquy. I would also commend the chairman and ranking member for reporting a balanced bill, particularly in support of the biofuels research development program within the Department of Energy. And I would like to clarify the intent of the conference committee with regard to this program. Am I correct in understanding that nothing in the conference report prohibits continuing research, development, and demonstration on energy crops for fuels and electricity or in any way discourages a continuation of the ongoing biomass electric program in all States in parallel to the ongoing biomass fuels research, development and demonstration program, on the understanding that the expenditures for the biomass electric program do not reduce the conferees' allocations to other biofuels programs?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, your assessment is correct here. There are some great programs here, some very impressive programs being demonstrated.

Mr. MINGE. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate your confirming the intent of the conference committee in this regard.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], a member of the Committee on Appropriations and one who has worked very closely with this subcommittee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a provision of this conference report which raises the concern of the conferees that the comprehensive management of our valuable salmon resources should be undertaken by the administration in the form of a memorandum of agreement. It is my understanding that the conference strongly encourages the administration to work with the Congress and interested parties in the development of the MOA. I, on behalf of my constituents in Washington's fifth district, want the opportunity to review and comment prior to its adoption, and I presume the administration will work with me and my other Northwest colleagues to that end. To the maximum extent practicable, this MOA should not result in increased electric or fish and wildlife costs in the region. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Washington is correct. The committee is very concerned about ensuring we do provide for the salmon problem and also about being careful as to who pays for it.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Subsection 508(b)(1) of the conference report provides for the sale of excess Federal power outside the region. This section requires that the power be offered on the same essential rates, terms and conditions to customers outside the region as is offered to Northwest customers. I understand this language to require BPA to offer the terms and conditions to Northwest customers first. So that if BPA intends to offer contracts of certain terms outside the region, it must offer the same terms to customers inside the region. The intent is to give customers inside the region a right of first refusal on all of the essential rates, terms and conditions in any contract, before BPA offers for sale energy outside the region. Is this correct?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. Your conferees grappled with this and tried to work out problems among parties from the region. We had some issues we had to work out with the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Resources.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thank the chairman very much for his hard work and certainly urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], with whom we have worked very hard trying to work out language on a problem.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]. Both of these gentlemen have worked exten-

sively with myself and my staff as well as the staff of our Senators and other members of the Colorado delegation, to come to some type of compromise. I would also like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I would rise to commend the remaining conferees on the energy and water appropriations bill for the action on the Animas-La Plata water project. The conference committee, led by the able gentleman from Indiana, Mr. MYERS and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BEVILL, Senators DOMENICI and JOHNSTON, have taken a decisive step toward expedient completion of the Animas-La Plata water project.

The United States has an 1868, 1868 treaty obligation to provide water to the Ute Mountain, Ute Tribe, and the Southern Ute Tribe. In the Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988, the U.S. Congress reaffirmed this obligation and determined the Animas-La Plata project was the only viable alternative to providing water to the Ute Tribes and directed the Secretary of Interior to begin construction of the Animas-La Plata project.

Today, 7 years after Congress directed the project be built and over a century after the original treaty was signed, the tribes are still waiting to receive their water. In fact, they are still waiting for construction to begin.

It is that failure to execute the terms of the 1988 act in a timely fashion which led the conferees to include section 507 in the appropriations bill. This section provides, in order to ensure the timely implementation of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Act of 1988, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to proceed without delay with construction of those facilities in conformance with the final biological opinion for the Animas-La Plata project in Colorado, and New Mexico, dated October 25, 1991.

I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to engage in a very brief colloquy with the chairman about the intent of this language. First of all, does the chairman agree if the construction does not begin in fiscal year 1996 that the water rights settlement is in jeopardy?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, this is correct. I have been on this committee for more than 25 years. Animas-La Plata, has been on our platter all that time. We have tried to resolve it. We have tried to work out differences with the environmentalists. It has been through frequent litigation. It is in jeopardy unless we get it moving right now. The committee recognizes that.

Mr. MCINNIS. What would the conferees expect from the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the section 507?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. It is the intent of this committee to direct the

Secretary to start construction immediately or as soon as possible, so we will fulfill the obligation we have to the Ute Indian Tribes who have given up their water rights through the years.

Mr. MCINNIS. I thank the chairman. I would again like to acknowledge the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], not only on the merits of what you have said but on the importance that you have placed on the word that we gave to the native American tribes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize the words of our chairman on this matter, and he has stated the case well, and I concur with his interpretation of the language we adopted in the conference report.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD a letter dated September 27, 1995, from the Southern Ute Indian Tribal Council, as follows:

SOUTHERN UTE INDIAN
TRIBAL COUNCIL,
Ignacio, CO, September 27, 1995.

Representative SCOTT MCINNIS,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

Re HR-1905, 1996 energy and water development appropriations bill.

DEAR SCOTT: In the very near future, the United States Congress will be considering HR-1905, the 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill. Sufficiency Language may be included in that legislation which will, at long last, enable the United States government to fulfill a trust responsibility to the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes by allowing the Animas-La Plata Water Resources Development Project to move forward, as promised by the Congress under the provisions of the 1988 Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act.

When you served in the Colorado legislature in the 1980's, you were an important part of the Settlement Agreement. With your assistance, the Colorado legislature appropriated almost \$60 million as the State's share of cost sharing with the federal government for construction of the Animas-La Plata Project. \$42 million of those funds still remain in escrow, ready to be spent to fulfill the State of Colorado's commitment to the settlement of the Colorado Ute Indian water claims.

Now that you are in Congress, we are again seeking your assistance to encourage your fellow congressmen to support fulfillment of the 1988 Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act. I know how my ancestors must have felt when the United States government repeatedly broke treaties with the Colorado Ute Indians. First in 1863, then in 1868, 1873, and finally in 1880. With each treaty the homelands of the Utes were reduced in size. Finally, in 1880, Congress confiscated all of the Ute lands in Colorado—over one-third of the State of Colorado. In the 1930's a small remnant of our aboriginal homelands in Southwestern Colorado were restored to tribal ownership.

Now the national environmental groups would have the United States government breach the agreement that was entered into in 1988. At that time, the Colorado Utes chose to negotiate rather than litigate and entered into another treaty, or contract with America, in return for deferring the Colorado Ute senior Winters water rights on rivers in Southwestern Colorado that cross the reservation. Congress and then President Reagan said, "We will build the Animas-La Plata Project. The Utes will have wet water—not paper water rights." Upon passage of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act, the legislation was hailed as a model for all tribes to follow—negotiate, do not litigate. Since passage, the states of Colorado, New Mexico, the water districts, the municipalities, and the Indian tribes, have been strangled in a swamp of red tape and bureaucratic backpeddling.

Now comes the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, not unlike the Indian givers of the last century. Do not honor our commitment to the Indians. Ignore the trust responsibility the United States government has under the Constitution of the United States. Sacrifice the Indian water claims on the altar of economics. It is too expensive to build the Animas-La Plata. Let's give the Indians "wampum" instead of water. My ancestors were all too familiar with the "beads for Manhattan" mentality of the early Indian traders. Colorado Ute Indian tribes honorably negotiated the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act, which mandates construction of the Animas-La Plata Project. In his inaugural message to the Congress, President Bush said "Great men, like great nations, must keep their promises. The Colorado Ute Indian tribes expect this great nation to keep its promise and construct the Animas-La Plata Project."

Sincerely,

LEONARD C. BURCH, Chairman,
Southern Ute Indian Tribe.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman and also the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] for their support in this legislation, and urge support of the conference report.

Let me say first of all that the conferees and certainly the House bill originally rejected the administration's proposed new role, limited role, I would say, for the Army Corps of Engineers in terms of flood control, shore protection, and also small navigation dredging projects. I am very pleased to see the conference adopted this approach and essentially rejected what the administration had proposed for the corps, because what it would have meant is that only projects that were nationally significant would have moved into subsequent phases and actually have been accomplished. Smaller projects would not have been done, whether they were flood control, shore protection, or dredging, and that would have meant essentially the States would have been left on their own to come up with funding and to provide the engineering for these kinds of projects.

I said all along the States do not have the resources or ability to do

that, and so effectively what the administration proposed would have meant these projects would not have been done.

I think that the chairman and the ranking member understood this and that is why the policy is not articulated in this legislation. It would have also been particularly detrimental to coastal States, one of which I represent.

I also wanted to praise the conferees for continued support for the continuing authorities program. They have instructed the Secretary to continue with all projects that are currently being conducted under the continuing authorities program, regardless of what stages they are in. This is again particularly beneficial to smaller communities like I represent. For relatively modest cost, the Federal Government puts money into these projects and lets a lot of the smaller towns do the projects, and they are very cost-effective. I have one in my district that I share actually with myself and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] on Poplar Brook. Again, a small amount of Federal dollars is used very cost effectively to achieve a good result.

I just wanted to put in a word of praise to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who spoke earlier. He really did an excellent job in supporting the projects in New Jersey, some of which, of course, are in my district. There has been a lot of support for the shore protection project along the Atlantic Coast which has been continuing for a number of years, has been very helpful to us, the tourism industry. We also were successful in getting the House version of funding on a lot of projects in New Jersey, some of which were not in the Senate bill, particularly the South River Dam, a flood control project, a very important project to me. I appreciate that.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report. I believe it represents a thoughtful approach to the difficult task of balancing our Nation's energy and water priorities in an era of fiscal restraint.

I commend the chairman and the conferees for coming up with a great product.

Included in this bill is a \$5.5 billion appropriation for the Department of Energy's environmental restoration and waste management budget—this part of the bill is actually an increase in spending over last year's funding level and it represents an acknowledgment on the part of the Federal Government that it indeed, does have a responsibility to clean up hazardous

stabilization projects of the Pick-Sloan era. The islands, wetlands, and flat floodplains needed to support the wildlife and waterfowl that once lived along the river are gone. An estimated 475,000 acres of habitat in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas have been lost. Today's fishery resources are estimated to be only one-fifth of those which existed in predevelopment days.

The conference report also provides \$200,000 for operation and maintenance and \$20,000 for construction of the Missouri national recreation river project. This project addresses a serious problem in protecting the river banks from the extraordinary and excessive erosion rates caused by the sporadic and varying releases from the Gavins Point Dam. These erosion rates are a result of previous work on the river by the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Member recognizes that the conference report also provides funding for a Bureau of Reclamation assessment of Nebraska's water supply—\$75,000—as well as funding for Army Corps projects in Nebraska at the following sites: Wood River; Papillion Creek and tributaries; Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake; Harlan County Lake; and Salt Creek and tributaries.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this Member commends the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the ranking member of the subcommittee for their continued support of these projects which are important to Nebraska and the First Congressional District, as well as to the people living in the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 24, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 748]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Bevill	Bryant (TX)
Ackerman	Billbray	Bunn
Allard	Billirakis	Bunning
Archer	Bishop	Burr
Armey	Bliley	Burton
Bachus	Blute	Buyer
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Callahan
Baker (LA)	Boehner	Calvert
Baldacci	Bonilla	Camp
Ballenger	Bonior	Canady
Barcia	Bono	Cardin
Barr	Borski	Castle
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Chabot
Bartlett	Brewster	Chambliss
Barton	Browder	Chapman
Bass	Brown (CA)	Chenoweth
Bateman	Brown (FL)	Christensen
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Chrysler
Bentsen	Brownback	Clay
Berman	Bryant (TN)	Clayton

Clinger	Hall (TX)	McNulty
Clyburn	Hamilton	Meehan
Coble	Hancock	Meek
Coburn	Hansen	Menendez
Coleman	Harman	Metcalfe
Collins (GA)	Hastert	Meyers
Collins (IL)	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Collins (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Miller (CA)
Combest	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Condit	Hayworth	Minge
Conyers	Hefner	Mink
Cooley	Heineman	Molinari
Costello	Henger	Mollohan
Cox	Hillery	Montgomery
Coyne	Hilliard	Moorhead
Cramer	Hinchey	Moran
Crane	Hobson	Morella
Crapo	Hoekstra	Murtha
Cremins	Hoke	Myers
Cubin	Holden	Myrick
Cunningham	Horn	Neal
Danner	Hostettler	Nethercutt
Davis	Houghton	Neumann
de la Garza	Hoyer	Ney
Deal	Hunter	Norwood
DeFazio	Hutchinson	Nussle
DeLauro	Hyde	Oberstar
DeLay	Inglis	Obey
Dellums	Istook	Olver
Deutsch	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Diaz-Balart	Jefferson	Orton
Dickey	Johnson (CT)	Owens
Dicks	Johnson (SD)	Oxley
Dingell	Johnson, E. B.	Packard
Dixon	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
Doggett	Johnston	Parker
Dooley	Jones	Pastor
Doolittle	Kanjorski	Paxon
Dorman	Kaptur	Payne (NJ)
Doyle	Kasich	Payne (VA)
Dreier	Kelly	Pelosi
Duncan	Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (FL)
Dunn	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
Durbin	Kennelly	Petri
Edwards	Kildee	Pickett
Ehlers	Kim	Pombo
Ehrlich	King	Pomeroy
Emerson	Kingston	Porter
Engel	Kleczka	Portman
English	Klink	Poshard
Ensign	Klug	Pryce
Eshoo	Knollenberg	Quillen
Evans	Kolbe	Quinn
Everett	LaFalce	Radanovich
Ewing	LaHood	Rahall
Farr	Lantos	Ramstad
Fattah	Largent	Regula
Fawell	Latham	Richardson
Fazio	LaTourette	Riggs
Fields (TX)	Laughlin	Rivers
Flake	Lazio	Roberts
Flanagan	Leach	Rogers
Foglietta	Levin	Rohrabacher
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Roukema
Fox	Lightfoot	Roybal-Allard
Frank (MA)	Lincoln	Rush
Frank (CT)	Linder	Sabo
Frank (NJ)	Lipinski	Sanders
Frelinghuysen	Livingston	Sanford
Frisa	LoBiondo	Sawyer
Frost	Lofgren	Saxton
Funderburk	Longley	Schaefer
Furse	Lowe	Schiff
Galleghy	Lucas	Schroeder
Ganske	Luther	Schumer
Gedensson	Maloney	Scott
Gekas	Manton	Seastrand
Gephardt	Manzullo	Serrano
Geren	Markey	Shadegg
Gibbons	Martinez	Shaw
Gilchrist	Martini	Shays
Gillmor	Mascara	Shuster
Gilman	Matsu	Sisisky
Gonzalez	McCarthy	Skaggs
Goodlatte	McCollum	Skeen
Goodling	McCrery	Skelton
Goss	McDade	Slaughter
Graham	McDermott	Smith (MI)
Green	McHale	Smith (NJ)
Greenwood	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Gunderson	McInnis	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	McIntosh	Solomon
Gutknecht	McKeon	Souder
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Spence

Spratt	Thurman	Waxman
Stark	Tiahrt	Weldon (FL)
Stenholm	Torkildsen	Weller
Stockman	Torres	White
Stokes	Torricelli	Whitfield
Studds	Towns	Wicker
Stump	Trafigant	Williams
Stupak	Upton	Wilson
Talent	Visclosky	Wise
Tate	Volkmer	Wolf
Tauzin	Vucanovich	Woolsey
Taylor (MS)	Waldholtz	Wyden
Taylor (NC)	Walker	Wynn
Tejeda	Walsh	Yates
Thomas	Wamp	Young (AK)
Thompson	Waters	Young (FL)
Thornberry	Watt (NC)	Zeliff
Thornton	Watts (OK)	Zimmer

NAYS—24

Andrews	Hefley	Salmon
Baessler	Jacobs	Scarborough
Barrett (WI)	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Beilenson	Nadler	Stearns
Clement	Rangel	Tanner
Fligner	Reed	Velazquez
Ford	Roemer	Vento
Gordon	Royce	Ward

NOT VOTING—6

Bereuter	Moakley	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Roth	Weldon (PA)

□ 1423

Mr. WARD and Mr. ROYCE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DINGELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it was this Member's intent to vote "aye" on October 31, 1995, on H.R. 1905, the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Appropriation Conference Report. This Member was present and attempted to vote in favor of the conference report, but apparently for some technical reason the vote was not recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 359.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 2491, SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, under the authority granted in clause 6 of rule X, the Speaker appoints Mr. BROWN of California as an additional conferee from the Committee on Agriculture for consideration of title I of the House bill, and subtitles A-C of title I of the

Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

WAVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The motion printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 may be offered only by Representative Callahan of Alabama or his designee. That motion shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against that motion are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor this rule to provide for consideration of the conference report for H.R. 1868, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. This is a simple, fair rule that will allow the House to vote on the conference report, and then on a separate motion dealing with the controversial issue of the restrictions on aid money for abortion. Specifically, as provided under House rules, we will have 1 hour of debate on the conference report itself—including the traditional right of the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions. Immediately following the consideration of the con-

ference report, the rule provides for a motion to dispose of Senate amendment 115—to be offered by the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], or his designee. This motion is debatable for a full hour, and the House will be able to cast an up or down vote following that debate. While the Callahan motion might sound complex, it can be summed up as follows: For years, under Presidents Reagan and Bush, there were sensible—in my view—restrictions on the use of foreign aid funds for abortion purposes; this policy is known as the Mexico City policy. However, during consideration of this bill, the House voted in favor of stricter standards, and the Senate voted for more lenient standards. To arrive at an acceptable solution to this dilemma, the conferees have decided to—no surprises here—go with the Mexico City policy. We are facilitating this agreement, by allowing Chairman CALLAHAN to offer his motion following debate on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that this conference report contains the original Goss amendment language on Haiti that the House adopted 252 to 164 on the 28th of June. This language provides a measure of accountability for the billions of taxpayers' dollars that have been spent in Haiti—and continue to be spent today. This measure was important in June, and it remains important today—we are still not sure exactly how much money has been used to restore President Aristide and maintain the peace in Haiti. But we do know that Haiti's fledgling democracy is facing some immediate challenges, including: Presidential elections, scheduled for the end of this year, but that date is rapidly slipping; reform of the justice system; and privatization of the economy which has suffered some setbacks recently.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the responsible use of the review mechanism provided under the Goss amendment with regard to Haiti, and I know other Members have other areas of concern in foreign ops as well, and there will be plenty of opportunity to debate them under the provisions of this fair and simple rule. I urge my colleagues to support the rule in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Florida, Mr. Goss, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing this rule to the floor.

House Resolution 249 makes it in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 1868, the foreign operations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996, and

waives all points of order against the conference report. The Rules Committee reported the rule without opposition by voice vote.

The joint statement of managers of the conference included \$108 million for basic education. This was a result of an amendment Mr. HOUGHTON and I offered on the House floor that received 263 votes.

During a hearing of the Rules Committee yesterday, Mr. BEILENSON asked Mr. CALLAHAN, chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, about the support of the conferees for the funding level of basic education. In response to the question, Mr. CALLAHAN replied that the conferees would strongly insist on that funding level. I hope that AID follows this direction.

I am disappointed with the large cuts in development assistance contained in this bill. However, I am glad that the conference committee earmarked \$300 million for child survival and ensured that UNICEF would receive \$100 million, and it contained a recommendation that basic education will receive \$108 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the well to urge Members to vote against the previous question on the rule when we have the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], or his designee, will be permitted to offer an amendment related to amendment No. 115, which has language concerning abortion and the United Nations Population Agency.

However, under the rule, Members are prohibited from offering amendments to that amendment. The White House has stated that if the language contained in the amendment by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is included in the foreign operations bill, the President will veto the bill. Under those circumstances, I would like to be able to try to offer compromise language that I believe would make real our apparent passage of the conference report on foreign operations today.

My amendment, which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD, would take out the so-called Mexico City language, which the administration opposes, leaving in a prohibition on lobbying for or against abortion, and prohibits funds to the United Nations Population Fund, unless UNFPA has terminated its program in China by May 1, 1996.

Mr. Speaker, permanent law already requires that none of the funds in this

their way but they are not quite held in December, they are obviously in substantial compliance and trying to do the job. I look forward to a peaceful turnover and a new President of Haiti and successful growth of democracy.

As to the gentlewoman from California, I have been invited by President Aristide for the succession. I have accepted his invitation. He said it would be February. If it is a little later than that, that is OK. I prefer to be in Haiti during the winter season than the summer season.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman. I think that takes care of my concern.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, this institution in a sense of moral outrage voted for an amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY] to deny assistance to Azerbaijan in reaction, in outrage to the fact that it continues an illegal and immoral blockade against the people of Armenia.

Our sense of outrage is understandable. Armenia is a landlocked country. Eighty-five percent of everything it needs to feed and to clothe and to warm its people comes through Azerbaijan. Five years since the United States originally took this position, the blockade being in place, they have done nothing, nothing to lift the blockade and stop the suffering of the Armenian people.

Indeed, today 95 percent of the people of Armenia are living on an income of less than \$1 a day in a harsh environment. So this House, knowing these facts, cast a vote insisting that the blockade be lifted. The other body, in debating foreign assistance as well, offered no contradictory provisions. There seemed to be no objections here or there. Yet, in the rule before us today, the Committee on Rules, having waived all points of order, we find that this provision is removed, and the Members of this House, if they approve the rule, are without recourse.

We are without recourse despite the fact that the rules of this House specifically state that there is an action of this House, there being nothing contradictory in the other body; therefore the conference would have no contradictory provisions, that an unrelated contradictory provision should not be in the bill. But it is.

We are without the ability to raise a point of order if the rule is enacted. Sadly, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and remind the Members that, if they feel this continuing outrage in the same vote they cast in June, that this embargo is wrong. It should stop, consistent with our ability

to deliver humanitarian assistance to Azerbaijan, because it is not covered but that no American assistance otherwise will continue unless and until the blockade is lifted. If Members continue to feel that view, there is one way to express themselves. That is to oppose the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the conference took up and considered a matter that had already been dealt with on the floor of the House. A vote was taken, and no similar provision was included in the Senate bill regarding humanitarian aid through the Government of Azerbaijan upon a finding that humanitarian assistance through nongovernmental organizations would be insufficient. It needs to be stressed, Mr. Speaker, that this language only permits humanitarian aid and does not require the President to provide any such aid in any event. Nonetheless, this provision is a grave error and should not have been included in the conference.

Azerbaijan itself holds the key to providing itself with United States assistance, because under section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, they may receive assistance if they take demonstrable steps, Mr. Speaker, to cease their blockading of and warring with Armenia and Karabakh. This is the correct approach.

The House had already considered and rejected amending section 907 through this bill, but provisions to resume aid to Azerbaijan that were struck on the floor of the House during consideration of the bill in June were reraised in the conference. I believe that as a matter of procedure and as a matter of respect for the will of this body, when no Senate bill contained a similar provision, there should be no provision providing for aid to Azerbaijan other than pursuant to section 907 before us today.

I am sorry the rule that we are considering does not allow this matter to be treated under the normal procedures for items in technical disagreement so that this decision could be reconsidered. While I understand the need to move the bill forward, I would hope that, when ultimately it undoubtedly will go back to the conference committee, that this matter can be corrected.

We should give assistance to Azerbaijan, particularly humanitarian assistance, but they should be forthcoming and lift their blockade on Armenia and Karabakh before we do so. That is exactly what the Freedom Support Act provides in section 907. It ought to be observed.

I might say also, Mr. Speaker, that the conference did, in regard to this area, two very fine things. They pro-

vided that the Humanitarian Corridor Act should be a part of this bill. That sends a message particularly to Turkey that, if they disrupt humanitarian assistance, they will not be entitled to any assistance from the United States; and that is as it should be.

In addition, we sent a very specific message to Turkey regarding their treatment of their Kurdish minority, their oppression of their Kurdish minority, their genocide against their Kurdish minority that has to be heard. It has now taken the place of repressing of expressions of disagreement with Government policy, and people get sent to jail.

□ 1500

It is time that we sent that message. The bill does so. I commend the conferees in approving both of those sections and commend the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the work that was done on a bipartisan basis many, many weeks ago. It was the very late evening of June 29. I believe it was an all-night session. I remember speaking on the floor, and I think it was about 2:30 in the morning when we debated this, and I think that it was one of the prouder moments for Members of this House as they recognized that Azerbaijan should not be rewarded for blockading Armenia. That blockade has imposed enormous, enormous human suffering on the Armenian people, and so together, from both sides of the aisle, we underscored that suffering, and we said that the House of Representatives was going to take the necessary, and important, and critical steps not to reward Azerbaijan for that, and so we went forward, and the language went forward, and it was unanimous. It was a voice vote of this House.

Now in another late night, when the conference met, it was misrepresented that what we had sent to the conference had somehow changed. It has not changed, and so that is why I rise in opposition to the rule and all of the Members of this House should vote against this rule, so that we can bring back the language that we so in unified fashion passed that late night, and we thought then that we were victorious for human rights, decency. The right thing to do is that that language would be appropriately restored.

I want to commend my colleagues that have worked so hard on this from both sides of the aisle, and this correction really does need to be made. We were misrepresented. The other body did not even speak on this; they saw that what we had done in the House that night, the night of June 29, should be retained, and for that reason I rise

in opposition to the rule and ask Members to join me in voting against it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am in a dilemma because I both support the words of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] and the words of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. I think that the issue of Azerbaijan and Armenia needs to be addressed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] tells me that it will go back to conference and it will be looked at. I hope that is the case.

On the second point, this Member personally believes that this body in Congress has no reason to get involved in family planning of other countries. As a matter of fact, I feel, no matter what side of the issue one is on, it should stay out of the bedrooms of American citizens, and I do not think it should be funded abroad or here in Congress, either way, and basically stay out of it. As my colleagues know, it is established under Roe versus Wade, and I think this body ought to stay the hell out of it.

Insofar as this bill, I would ask support of the rule, and I will work with the gentlemen on the other side to make sure that the Azerbaijan-Armenia issue is included.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise also in opposition to the rule because it waives all points of order. Yesterday I went before the Committee on Rules and urged that the point of order not be waived with respect to my opposition to language that essentially repeals section 907 of the Free Support Act relating to aid to Azerbaijan. Let me explain why I believe that this is a very serious procedural breach, if I can.

As was mentioned by some of the previous speakers, we had an extensive debate, 2½ hours, on the night of June 29 on the issue of section 907. Under current law section 907 prohibits direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan because of their blockade of Armenia and Karabakh. What happened in the subcommittee was that language was added that essentially repealed section 907 and said that direct government aid could be sent to Azerbaijan for humanitarian purposes assuming that the President decided that that was appropriate. We had extensive debate on the House floor on the issue, and we voted by voice vote overwhelmingly, to take that language out that repeals section 907, and during the debate on the House floor it was abundantly clear that we were talking about humanitarian assistance, that we were talking about the discretion of the President of the United States to grant that humanitarian assistance, and that we were talking about assistance that was going to go to refugees.

Now when the conference met, new language, which is essentially the same as the old language, was put into the conference bill contrary to the vote on the floor of this House that says the same thing, that says that it is OK to give humanitarian assistance to refugees in Azerbaijan if the President decides that that is what he wants to do. There is no difference between this new language and the old language that was deleted by the House of Representatives. Substantively it is the same, and the way I understand it, that means that we should be able to raise the point of order today and take that language out of the conference bill because it is substantially the same.

All we are asking for today, and the reason we are opposed to the rule, is because we are not given the opportunity to reiterate our opposition to this language and to reiterate what the House has already said. I certainly hope there will be an opportunity, if this bill is vetoed or if it is not passed in the Senate, to reopen the conference and that we will have that opportunity in some future weeks to deal with this again, but the bottom line is that this rule is inappropriate because we have the same substantive language here, and do not let anybody say that it is not the same. There is no question that the debate was complete for 2½ hours and this was understood by everyone.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I join in this protest against the disregard of the will of this House by the conference committee. I was a participant in the debate in the wee small hours of the morning of June 29, and I do believe that, if for no other reason than out of a regard for the will of the Members of this House, this conference report is out of line.

I protest on another ground as well, and that is that the nation of Azerbaijan has used the revolving-door style of lobbying to accomplish its legislative objectives. There have been press reports about Azerbaijan hiring for millions of dollars a firm headed by a former Member of this body, a convicted felon, who led the lobbying campaign to remove the provision barring aid to Azerbaijan unless it lifted the blockade of Armenia.

Finally, of course, there is the substance of this matter. Azerbaijan has been acting in a heartless, cruel, ruthless way to try to strangle and destroy its neighbor. It is appropriate that the United States, in a demonstration of our humanitarian values, use the power and the leverage that we have to change the policy of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we got it right the first time on June 29, and I believe it was wrong for the conference committee to disregard the will of this House and the will of the other body.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for yielding this time to me, and I rise in strong opposition to this rule. This rule does not allow a point of order to be raised against the language that would now allow direct payments to be made to the Government of Azerbaijan that continues to create a blockade against the country of Armenia. Section 907 that has been mentioned before is a provision that was signed into law by President George Bush, indicates that, as soon as that blockade is lifted, direct payments can be made to the government. So, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] mentioned earlier in his remarks, the key to this issue lies with the actions of the Government of Azerbaijan.

Originally the House bill contained language that overrode 907 and would allow those direct payments to this government that continues the blockade of the Armenian people. That was stripped by this House by voice vote on the evening of June 29. The House has spoken on this issue, the Senate did not take this issue up, and there was no contention in conference, although language clearly has now been added back in that would allow these payments to be made directly to the Government of Azerbaijan without them having to lift the blockade.

There is a lot of talk and discussion about the plight of the refugees. We all share that concern. But in their heart of hearts, if that Government of Azerbaijan was so concerned, they can lift the blockade, and that is the point of 907 that today, by passing this bill and being prohibited from raising a point of order, we are now in a moment going to overturn.

I again emphasize my strong opposition to this rule because we are not provided an opportunity to strike the provision.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I encourage our colleagues to vote against it for two reasons at least.

One reason has been discussed by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle—the rule does not allow the language that is contained in the legislation about Azerbaijan to be considered. As our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] has said, this rule waives all points of order.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], made a good-faith effort, I believe, in our conference to moderate the language that he was suggesting for the bill. Nonetheless, all of his good intentions notwithstanding,

to be made in the future. The first step in the process of making a decision is to determine the facts of the case. This is done by gathering information from all sources available. The next step is to analyze the facts and determine the issues involved. This is done by identifying the points of contention and the arguments on each side. The final step is to make a decision based on the facts and the arguments. This is done by weighing the evidence and making a judgment as to which side is more likely to be correct. The decision is then communicated to the parties involved and the case is closed.

The first step in the process of making a decision is to determine the facts of the case. This is done by gathering information from all sources available. The next step is to analyze the facts and determine the issues involved. This is done by identifying the points of contention and the arguments on each side. The final step is to make a decision based on the facts and the arguments. This is done by weighing the evidence and making a judgment as to which side is more likely to be correct. The decision is then communicated to the parties involved and the case is closed.

The first step in the process of making a decision is to determine the facts of the case. This is done by gathering information from all sources available. The next step is to analyze the facts and determine the issues involved. This is done by identifying the points of contention and the arguments on each side. The final step is to make a decision based on the facts and the arguments. This is done by weighing the evidence and making a judgment as to which side is more likely to be correct. The decision is then communicated to the parties involved and the case is closed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The ayes and noes were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 257, noes 165, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 750]

AYES—257

Allard	Fawell	LoBiondo
Archer	Fields (TX)	Loftgren
Armey	Flanagan	Longley
Bachus	Foley	Lucas
Baker (CA)	Fowler	Manzullo
Baker (LA)	Fox	Mascara
Baldacci	Franks (CT)	McCollum
Ballenger	Franks (NJ)	McCrery
Barcia	Frisa	McDade
Barr	Frost	McHugh
Barrett (NE)	Funderburk	McInnis
Bartlett	Galleghy	McIntosh
Barton	Ganske	Metcalfe
Bass	Gekas	Mica
Bateman	Geren	Miller (FL)
Bereuter	Gilchrest	Molinari
Bilbray	Gillmor	Mollohan
Billirakis	Gilman	Montgomery
Bliley	Goodlatte	Murtha
Blute	Goodling	Myers
Boehlert	Goss	Myrick
Boehner	Graham	Nethercutt
Bonilla	Green	Neumann
Bono	Greenwood	Ney
Boucher	Gunderson	Nussle
Brewster	Gutknecht	Oberstar
Browder	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Brownback	Hall (TX)	Orton
Bryant (TN)	Hamilton	Oxley
Bunn	Hancock	Packard
Bunning	Hansen	Parker
Burr	Hastert	Paxon
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Payne (VA)
Buyer	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Callahan	Hayworth	Petri
Calvert	Hefley	Pombo
Camp	Heineman	Porter
Canady	Henger	Poshard
Chabot	Hilleary	Pryce
Chambliss	Hobson	Quillen
Chenoweth	Hoekstra	Quinn
Christensen	Holden	Rahall
Chrysler	Horn	Ramstad
Clinger	Hostettler	Regula
Coble	Houghton	Riggs
Coburn	Hunter	Roberts
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Rogers
Collins (IL)	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Combest	Inglis	Roth
Condit	Istook	Roukema
Cooley	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Costello	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Cox	Jones	Sanford
Crane	Kanjorski	Saxton
Crapo	Kasich	Scarborough
Creameans	Kelly	Schaefer
Cubin	Kildee	Schiff
Cunningham	Kim	Seastrand
Davis	King	Sensenbrenner
de la Garza	Kingston	Shadegg
Deal	Klink	Shaw
DeLay	Klug	Shays
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Shuster
Dickey	Kolbe	Skeen
Doolittle	LaFalce	Skelton
Dornan	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Doyle	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Dreier	Latham	Smith (TX)
Duncan	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Dunn	Laughlin	Solomon
Ehlers	Lazio	Souder
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
English	Lightfoot	Stenholm
Ensign	Linder	Stockman
Everett	Lipinski	Stump
Ewing	Livingston	Stupak

Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton

Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White

Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—165

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Obey
Ackerman	Gibbons	Oliver
Andrews	Gonzalez	Owens
Baessler	Gordon	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Pastor
Becerra	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Bellenson	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hilliard	Pickett
Bevill	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hoke	Radanovich
Boniior	Hoyer	Rangel
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Brown (CA)	Jacobs	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Cardin	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Castle	Kaptur	Rush
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clayton	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clement	Klecza	Schroeder
Clyburn	Lantos	Schumer
Coleman	Leach	Scott
Collins (MI)	Levin	Serrano
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Siskisky
Coyne	Lincoln	Skaggs
Cramer	Lowey	Slaughter
Danner	Luther	Spratt
DeFazio	Maloney	Stark
DeLauro	Manton	Stokes
Dellums	Markey	Studds
Deutsch	Martinez	Tanner
Dicks	Martini	Thompson
Dingell	Matsui	Thornton
Dixon	McCarthy	Thurman
Doggett	McDermott	Torkildsen
Dooley	McHale	Torres
Durbin	McKeon	Torricelli
Edwards	McKinney	Towns
Engel	McNulty	Trafigant
Eshoo	Meehan	Velazquez
Evans	Meek	Vento
Farr	Menendez	Visclosky
Fattah	Meyers	Ward
Fazio	Mfume	Waters
Filner	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Flake	Minge	Waxman
Foglietta	Mink	Williams
Forbes	Moorhead	Wise
Ford	Moran	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Morella	Wyden
Frelinghuysen	Nadler	Wynn
Furse	Neal	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Fields (LA)	Portman	Volkmer
Gephardt	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
Moakley	Tejeda	
Norwood	Tucker	

□ 1556

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DE LA GARZA and Mr. OBERSTAR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 750 on H.R. 2492, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-130)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1995, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on November 1, 1994.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against Iran and of the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. Indeed, on March 15 of this year, I declared a separate national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and imposed separate sanctions. By Executive Order 12959, these sanctions were significantly augmented. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the November 14, 1979, declaration of emergency, including the authority to block certain property of the Government of Iran, and which are needed in the process of implementing the January 1981 agreements with Iran.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 31, 1995.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1868), making appropriations for foreign operations,

export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 26, 1995, at page H10974.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1868, now under consideration, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring back to the House the conference report on H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs.

The conference agreement represents a reduction of approximately \$1.5 billion, or 11 percent, below the 1995 enacted level. It is also a cut of almost \$2.7 billion, or 18 percent, below the President's request.

In addition, we are below the budget allocation for this bill by \$156 million in discretionary budget authority.

The agreement protects important child survival and disease programs, as we had proposed in the House bill. The Senate bill contained no protections whatsoever for these programs. The conferees also direct that \$100 million be provided for UNICEF, instead of a cut as assumed in the Senate bill.

In general, the House bill did not include authorization provisions that were not cleared by the relevant authorization committees. I can honestly say that I did not want authorization language on our appropriation bill. I have great respect for Chairman GILMAN and his colleagues on the International Relations Committee and I did my utmost to eliminate objectionable authorization language when the House considered H.R. 1868. However, the Senate included dozens of legislative provisions in the 193 amendments it made to the House bill. We were successful in deleting many of these in conference.

We also worked with the authorization committee to modify or retain those provisions of most interest to them. In particular, we worked closely with them on the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act and the NATO Participation Act amendments.

As I stated earlier, we had 193 Senate amendments to contend with in conference, and we were able to reach an agreement on all but one. The Senate conferees refused to accept the will of the House of Representatives on population funding and abortion.

Once the House has acted on the conference report, under the rule, I will ask the House to send back to the Senate the substance of a compromise amendment I offered in conference on the Mexico City abortion policy. This compromise has the support of the author of the amendment that was approved by the House, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

There are several matters in the conference agreement that merit further comment and clarification today.

With regard to concerns about conference report language on Azerbaijan, I want to repeat the statement I made before the Rules Committee: As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I expect to be consulted in advance and notified in writing on a case by case basis each time the President uses the limited waiver provided by the Wilson amendment.

Until the parties involved meet and agree to reduce the tension in the Caucasus region and terminate all

blockades, which I believe is possible in coming months, this provision is a temporary, highly conditional waiver of aid to refugees and displaced persons only in Azerbaijan. It in no way overturns the much more extensive limitations on aid under current law, all of which are currently subject to a Presidential waiver.

Once Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia agree to open railroads, pipelines, and other communications in the region, the President will be in a position to make the determination required under section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, and the Wilson provision will no longer be relevant.

With regard to language prohibiting the Agency for International Development's move to the elaborate and expensive new Federal Triangle Building, the language means just what it says. Before the Administrator of AID undertakes any other move that may be required, I expect him to fully consult with the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and make the reports requested by the conferees.

No funds are provided in this conference agreement for AID's move to the Federal Triangle. No other funds should be used for a move to the Federal Triangle. As far as this committee is concerned, that proposal is denied.

In conclusion, I'd like to thank my ranking minority member, Mr. WILSON, for his invaluable assistance in reaching a conference agreement on this bill. I'd also like to pay tribute to Mr. OBEY, the ranking Democrat on the full committee, for his assistance and advice throughout this process. I'm happy to say that they and all the other House and Senate members of the conference have signed the conference report.

In closing, I would remind the House that other members and the administration are ready and willing to add millions to this bill. Defeating this conference agreement would leave the door open for another bill that would cut less than this one.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

FY 1996 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1868) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:						
Inter-regional paid-in capital	28,111,959	25,952,110	25,950,000	25,952,110	25,952,110	-2,159,849
(Limitation on callable capital)	(1,594,568,180)	(1,523,767,142)	(1,523,000,000)	(1,523,767,142)	(1,523,767,142)	(-70,801,038)
Fund for special operations	21,338,000	20,835,000	20,000,000	10,000,000	-11,338,000
Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	75,000,000	100,000,000	70,000,000	115,000,000	53,750,000	-21,250,000
Inter-American Investment Corporation	190,000	-190,000
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank.....	(1,719,208,139)	(1,670,554,252)	(1,618,950,000)	(1,684,719,252)	(1,613,469,252)	(-105,738,887)
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	13,221,596	13,200,000	13,221,596	13,221,596	+ 13,221,596
(Limitation on callable capital)	(647,858,204)	(647,000,000)	(647,858,204)	(647,858,204)	(+ 647,858,204)
Development fund	167,960,000	304,528,525	100,000,000	110,000,000	100,000,000	-87,960,000
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	(167,960,000)	(965,608,325)	(760,200,000)	(771,079,800)	(761,079,800)	(+ 593,119,800)
Contribution to the African Development Fund	62,215,309	127,247,025	-62,215,309
Contribution to the African Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	133,000	-133,000
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,002,540)	(-2,002,540)
Total, contribution to the African Development Bank	(2,135,540)	(-2,135,540)
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Paid-in capital	69,180,353	81,916,447	69,180,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+ 819,647
(Limitation on callable capital)	(161,420,824)	(191,138,376)	(161,400,000)	(163,333,333)	(163,333,333)	(+ 1,912,509)
Total, contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	(230,601,177)	(273,054,823)	(230,580,000)	(233,333,333)	(233,333,333)	(+ 2,732,156)
North American Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital	56,250,000	56,250,000	25,000,000	56,250,000	+ 56,250,000
(Limitation on callable capital)	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(+ 318,750,000)
International Monetary Fund						
Contribution to the enhanced structural adjustment facility	25,000,000	25,000,000	-25,000,000
Total, contribution to International Financial Institutions	(4,307,796,208)	(5,921,853,401)	(4,424,189,000)	(4,865,097,361)	(4,718,447,361)	(+ 410,651,153)
Budget authority	1,805,880,750	2,328,864,666	1,030,139,000	1,299,913,669	1,153,263,669	-652,617,081
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,501,915,458)	(3,592,988,735)	(3,394,050,000)	(3,565,183,692)	(3,565,183,692)	(+ 1,063,268,234)
International Organizations and Programs						
International organizations and programs	359,000,000	425,000,000	155,000,000	260,000,000	285,000,000	-74,000,000
(By transfer)	(15,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+ 30,000,000)
Total, title IV, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance	(4,666,796,208)	(6,346,853,401)	(4,579,189,000)	(5,125,097,361)	(5,003,447,361)	(+ 336,651,153)
Budget authority	2,164,880,750	2,753,864,666	1,185,139,000	1,559,913,669	1,438,263,669	-726,617,081
(By transfer)	(15,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+ 30,000,000)
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,501,915,458)	(3,592,988,735)	(3,394,050,000)	(3,565,183,692)	(3,565,183,692)	(+ 1,063,268,234)
Grand total, all titles:						
New budget (obligational) authority	13,654,521,750	14,773,904,666	11,901,375,000	12,413,914,000	12,103,536,669	-1,550,985,081
(By transfer)	(850,000)	(15,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+ 49,150,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(22,150,000)	(24,020,000)	(24,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(23,250,000)	(+ 1,100,000)
(Limitation on callable capital)	(2,501,915,458)	(3,592,988,735)	(3,394,050,000)	(3,565,183,692)	(3,565,183,692)	(+ 1,063,268,234)
(Loan authorizations)	(1,278,496,000)	(2,619,883,000)	(1,943,658,000)	(2,200,112,000)	(2,027,258,000)	(+ 748,762,000)
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE						
Export Assistance Appropriations	931,031,000	1,043,000,000	967,779,000	986,000,000	970,165,000	+ 39,134,000
Negative Subsidies and Offsetting Collections	-201,276,000	-292,146,000	-292,146,000	-292,146,000	-292,146,000	-90,870,000
Total, Export Assistance	729,755,000	750,854,000	675,633,000	693,854,000	678,019,000	-51,736,000
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
Bilateral Development Assistance	3,939,688,000	4,235,197,000	3,654,024,000	3,962,213,331	3,500,864,000	-438,824,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	3,793,502,000	3,762,300,000	3,223,600,000	3,055,000,000	3,324,600,000	-468,902,000
Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance	7,733,190,000	7,997,497,000	6,877,624,000	7,017,213,331	6,825,464,000	-907,726,000
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
Grants	3,151,279,000	3,262,020,000	3,211,279,000	3,207,500,000	3,208,390,000	+ 57,111,000
Direct loans, subsidy costs	47,917,000	89,888,000	64,400,000	64,400,000	64,400,000	+ 18,483,000
(Estimated level of direct loans)	(619,650,000)	(765,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(-75,850,000)
Subtotal, Foreign Military Financing Program:
Budget authority	3,199,196,000	3,351,908,000	3,275,679,000	3,271,900,000	3,272,790,000	+ 73,594,000
(Program level)	(3,770,929,000)	(4,027,020,000)	(3,755,279,000)	(3,751,500,000)	(3,752,390,000)	(-18,539,000)

FY 1996 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1868) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Other, Military	109,500,000	139,781,000	107,300,000	91,033,000	109,000,000	-500,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund	-282,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	+62,000,000
Total, Military Assistance Programs	3,026,696,000	3,271,689,000	3,162,979,000	3,142,933,000	3,161,790,000	+135,094,000
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
Contributions to International Financial Institutions	1,780,880,750	2,303,864,666	1,030,139,000	1,299,913,669	1,153,263,669	-627,617,081
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	25,000,000	25,000,000	-25,000,000
International organizations and programs	359,000,000	425,000,000	155,000,000	260,000,000	285,000,000	-74,000,000
Total, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance	2,164,880,750	2,753,864,666	1,185,139,000	1,559,913,669	1,438,263,669	-726,617,081
Grand total, all titles	13,654,521,750	14,773,904,666	11,901,375,000	12,413,914,000	12,103,536,669	-1,550,985,081

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with a mixed recommendation on the foreign operations appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

On one hand I support passage of the conference report on the bill. Although I am not fully happy with every aspect of the conference report—especially with the large number of earmarks included under the account funding the former Soviet Union—based on the funding available it is as good as we can do. The \$12.1 billion bill is \$2.7 billion below the President's request, \$1.6 billion below last year, \$202 million above the House-passed bill and \$310 million below the Senate bill.

Therefore I urge Members to support the conference report.

On the other hand, the conference was not able to come to an agreement on how to handle language in the bill concerning the so-called Mexico City policy language that Representative SMITH had added on the floor. The administration has informed me that if this language remains in the bill, the President will veto the bill.

In addition to the Presidential veto that would be created by this language, the Senate appears totally unwilling to accept this language—therefore we can't even get a bill to the President with this language included in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress is serious about sending a signal to the President for fiscal year 1996 foreign operations, then I urge Members to reject the amendment by Mr. CALLAHAN adding the Mexico City language back into the bill.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman CALLAHAN for his cooperation and manner in handling the conference on the bill. I believe we have been able to come up with a bipartisan agreement on foreign assistance for fiscal year 1996, and therefore one that is in the best interest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time. I commend both he and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for their splendid work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference report. We are continuing the downward trend in foreign aid spending that has occurred over the last decade.

We spent \$18.3 billion on foreign operations in fiscal year 1985, which is \$25 billion in today's dollars. This bill is \$12.1 billion. We have cut foreign aid in half over 11 years.

Mr. CALLAHAN worked with members of the subcommittee, the authorizing committee, the administration, and our Senate counterparts to allocate the shrinking foreign assistance dollars in the fairest manner possible. The conference report was signed by every member of the conference committee. This bipartisan support is a great tribute to the spirit of compromise exhibited by the subcommittee chairman and the members of the committee.

This bill cuts \$1.5 billion from last year's level, and \$2.8 billion from the President's request. We are 11 percent below last year and 18 percent below the President. Despite the cuts, we have protected the most vulnerable—the world's children.

The conference report provides \$300 million for child survival programs, which is \$25 million more than current year funding.

This bill reduces old-style government-to-government foreign aid. Instead, we invest in programs that allow private companies to expand exports and foreign investment to make broad-based economic growth a reality in developing free markets.

We have avoided the temptation to score political potshots with this bill. We vastly curtailed the numerous Senate earmarks which would have interfered with our Nation's foreign policy. We cut spending, but we provide the President with the resources to conduct a global foreign policy.

We have accepted the reorganization savings made by the authorizing committee, and kept the funding levels in line with the levels provided in H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act.

We have maintained the funding levels to meet our Camp David commitments for Egypt and Israel.

And, we've made children a priority. This is a responsible and balanced bill and I urge your support for Mr. CALLAHAN's good work.

I also want to address a few of the important foreign policy issues which were included in this appropriations bill.

Brown amendment:

The conferees agreed to the Brown amendment which brings some fairness to our relations with Pakistan.

Because of the Pressler amendment, the United States currently holds F-16's and other military equipment that was purchased by Pakistan in the 1980's, and we hold the money Pakistan paid for the equipment.

President Clinton stated that it is "unfair to keep both Pakistan's money and its equipment."

Under the Brown amendment, we will sell the F-16's to a third country and reimburse Pakistan's investment, and we will deliver the 5-year-old equipment that Pakistan purchased before the Pressler sanction took effect.

This is an important compromise which keeps in place the Pressler amendment restrictions against military assistance and military sales, but allows assistance for counternarcotics control, humanitarian assistance, and antiterrorism.

The Brown amendment will go a long way to repair relations with Pakistan which has a long history of support for United States, especially during cold war.

Pakistan signed Mutual Defense Treaty with the United States and allowed United States

bases to conduct reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union during cold war.

Pakistan joined anti-Communist alliances such as CENTO and SEATO which were designed to contain Soviet Union.

Pakistan joined the United States in to rolling-back Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Pakistan supported the United States in Persian Gulf.

Pakistan contributes U.N. troops to Bosnia, Haiti, Somalia, and others.

Pakistan is a moderate, Islamic ally.

The Brown amendment doesn't resume military assistance to Pakistan, it merely allows return of military equipment which had been purchased more than 5 years ago.

KEDO;

We have also reached a compromise with the administration over promises the administration made to encourage North Korea to discontinue its dangerous nuclear program.

The conference report provides that the United States may contribute funds to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization [KEDO] for administrative expenses and heavy fuel oil costs associated with the agreed framework. However, none of the funds in the bill may be used to contribute to the lightwater nuclear reactors being provided to North Korea under the terms of the agreed framework.

Turkey:

I would also like to note that the conference committee limited economic support funds to Turkey in recognition of the strong concerns over Turkey's human rights record. However, we avoided more onerous language which would have damaged our important bilateral relationship with Turkey.

I want to bring my colleagues attention to an important article in yesterday's Washington Times. As the article indicates, Turkey is at a crossroads. Turkey's leaders are trying to direct Turkey to align with the western nations, but Islamic fundamentalists are working to push Turkey away from the European Union and NATO, and associate more closely with Islamic nations in the Arab world and central Asia.

We must be careful to urge Turkey to adopt basic human rights in their counterterrorism efforts against the PKK, but we must not push so hard that we drive Turkey into the Islamic fundamentalist fold.

Turkey is making efforts to improve its record. The State Department report on the situation in Turkey contends that Turkey has started human rights training for military, made public the Code of Conduct for the military, and it has passed democracy-expanding proposals in the parliament. The State Department stated in July, "We can and should expect progress."

Just this week, Turkey adopted amendments to Article 8 of the controversial antiterrorism law. The State Department spokesman Nicholas Burns stated:

The United States is pleased to note that on October 27, Turkey's Parliament approved legislation amending Article 8 of the Anti-Terror Law. We congratulate the Turkish Government, Parliament, and people on this important and positive step forward for democracy and human rights.

I think this Congress should recognize Turkey's positive steps to reform their human rights policies.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois is rock rib in his perseverance of his ideals and philosophies. The gentleman is a valuable member of our subcommittee. I do not know what we would do without the gentleman.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

I commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and his capable subcommittee staff for their hard work on this conference report—it represents the product of thousands of hours of work and 10 hour conference with the other body.

And I would note, in light of the bill totals that we today consider, that foreign aid spending has clearly made its contribution to deficit reduction.

I also want to particularly note a number of matters addressed in this conference report:

First, I am pleased that we have maintained our commitment to the Camp David peace partners, and also to the ongoing peace process while, at the same time, including reasonable accountability requirements on recipients of peace process assistance. These provisions represent a sensible approach to accountability and one that will not impede the peace process.

Second, I am also pleased that we have maintained our commitment to the reunification of Cyprus with a continuation of \$15 million in support for bicomunal efforts on the island.

Third, similarly, I rise in strong support of the full funding for Armenia that we have included. Armenia is proving itself to be a model for other Newly Independent States in developing democratic institutions and practices and resisting extremist views. The \$85 million in humanitarian assistance, together with the other funds for Armenia requested by the administration are included in this conference report. These funds are vitally important and I am pleased that they are included.

Fourth, unfortunately, the levels of support for some activities in this bill are not what they should be.

First, I note that the conference report contains \$35 million toward the global environment facility, a project initiated by President Bush. While I am glad that we are maintaining support of this activity, I think all members should note that the GEF has done more than its share toward deficit reduction.

Second, I am pleased that we were able to somewhat restore the reductions in assistance to international organizations, with language allowing administrative flexibility in this account. I encourage the President to maintain a strong level of commitment to the United Nations Development Program, as the resources to do so are

available. The UNDP is headed by a very capable American, Mr. Gus Speth, and we should give him our strong support. Similarly, the President must also maintain support for the U.N.'s fund for victims of torture.

I also am pleased that we have included language to reauthorize the Au Pair Program for 1 year to end the crisis that ensued on October 1 when this program expired. This program never should have been allowed to expire. I plead with the authorizing committees to move forward on a longer term reauthorization of this activity so that this sort of crisis can be avoided in the future.

This report also contains certain important policy decisions, including those respecting Turkey that I have already discussed.

In particular, I believe that the landmine moratorium provisions that we have included will prove exceptionally valuable in controlling the indiscriminate violence perpetrated by these weapons.

I am also pleased that we have expanded sanctions against the Thai military to force them to stop their cross border mahogany trade with the Khmer Rouge. Not only does this trade bolster one of the most genocidal groups to ever terrorize the planet, but it does so at an immense price to our environment—the Khmer Rouge are destroying ancient rainforests with the same disregard for nature that they have shown for human life. For reasons of foreign policy and environmental protection, these sanctions are badly needed.

In addition, I am pleased that we have stepped up the pressure on Guatemala to bring to justice those who are covering up gross human rights violations and continuing to perpetrate new violations to this day. This month's massacre of Mayan civilians by the Army make clear that the Guatemalan military is not reforming itself and is not respecting human rights. The recent beating of American Sky Callahan shows that the Guatemalan military retains no respect for standards of human rights. We should not support these butchers with U.S. assistance and we should not allow them to enter our country. In this regard, I call on the Judiciary Committee to move swiftly on legislation to rescind visas for members of the Guatemalan military who have been complicit in gross human rights abuses.

Finally, I want to mention the issue of satisfaction of certain obligations to Pakistan. I support the action of the conferees, although I would personally prefer to provide nonlethal aid to Pakistan. I would, however, caution the Government of Pakistan and its lobbyists here in town not to read too much into the conferees' action. This does not represent a retrenchment of our concerns about nuclear proliferation in

Pakistan and it does not represent our picking sides in the tensions between Pakistan and India.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman yields back 1½ minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill continues a 10-year downward trend in financing for foreign aid, and that downward trend is unavoidable, given the existing budget crunch that we face. I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done a fine job under the circumstances, as has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and I salute them both.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are some mistakes in this bill. I, for instance, do not believe that we should earmark funds for any country. I think that the Congress, unless we are facing extraordinary circumstances, should not be in a position to require the President to spend money on any country. I certainly do not oppose where these earmarks go. Israel, for instance, deserves great credit for steadfastly trying to move toward a resolution of the turmoil which we have seen in the Middle East for many, many years. I think that Egypt has cooperated fully in that process. I recognize in the past we have earmarked those Middle Eastern countries because we have not wanted to undermine the peace process, and I have no objection to that.

But I do question the wisdom of earmarking over 50 percent of the funds that go to countries that were within the former Soviet Union, even though, again, I have no objection if the President wants to support those initiatives to those countries, because I think we need to be engaged in that region. I would simply say that I have defended Republican Presidents for 8 years against earmarks by the Congress, and I feel obligated to do the same for a Democratic President of my own party.

There are some other problems I have with the bill, as anyone might, but, overall, I think that the bill is not a bad bill, and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, there is a problem: The bill as structured, provides for a return to the Mexico City language, which the administration strenuously objects to, and the administration has indicated that the President will veto the bill. I would not personally veto the bill over that item, but the administration intends to do so. So I will simply be offering a motion to recommit to try to find a middle ground.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be providing an amendment, the language of which would cut

off family planning funds to organizations with which the committee disagrees with respect to abortion. It would also cut off aid to the UN Population Agency because they have a program in China who the committee feels is conducting forced abortions.

My amendment would contrast with that amendment in this way: First of all, and I will simply read this language, it provides that none of the funds made available under this act may be used to lobby for or against abortion. I think everyone agrees with that.

Second, it would drop the language on the cutoff of family planning assistance, because I believe that we ought to keep a very firm line between the issue of abortion and the issue of family planning.

Third, it would provide the same cutoff that the Callahan amendment would provide in China, except for changing the date. It would read as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund unless the President certifies to the appropriate Congressional committees that, (1), the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than May 1, 1996; or, (2), during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as a result of coercion associated with family planning activities of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China.

As used in this section, the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressures.

I think it is important for us on both sides of the aisle to send a signal to the United Nations population program that we are firmly convinced that the so-called population program in China is in fact coerced abortion, or at least it is facilitating coerced abortion. Anyone who takes a look at the record understands that is exactly what is going on in China.

□ 1615

So all my amendment would do is give the agency 2 additional months to end their involvement in China or else face a total cutoff of funds. I think that is more realistic administratively and it would remain identical with respect to the rest of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

No one agrees with him more than I do about earmarking funds. The gentleman taught me well when I served in the minority and he was chairman of this committee, or this subcommittee. I agree with the gentleman whole-

heartedly that we make big mistakes, and when this bill left the House there was no earmarking in our bill. So we both share philosophically the same idea with respect to earmarking.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that we had to agree to any, but this is a body of compromise and in this compromise we had with the Senate we had to agree to some things, but then they had to agree to some things. They wanted to come back and increase the amount of money, and I felt by earmarking some of the money for some of the countries that they insisted upon that the American people were better served by the reductions that we were able to save in spending in foreign countries.

With respect to the Mexico City language, this language that I intend to introduce is modified to meet some of the demands of the administration. I think we are at a point that the President must recognize that if he vetoes this bill because of the Mexico City language that is going to be therein that he will have to veto the CR, which will contain this language. So he will have to face it one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, we have compromised with the President. We have given him every latitude. We have preserved for him the ability to have an effective foreign policy. But the President must recognize and live with the fact that the Smith language no doubt is going to be in whatever foreign operations bill we pass this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], my friend and former freshman Member 11 years ago in this House, a member of this subcommittee and certainly a good friend and big contributor to our efforts on foreign operations.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time. It is nice to be an 11 year old freshman, I guess.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. Let me commend Chairman CALLAHAN and our ranking Member CHARLIE WILSON, for a job well done. The conference report we are presenting to the House today demonstrates that we can produce a foreign aid bill which advances the foreign policy interests of the United States and plays a role in our Nation's highest national interest—balancing the Federal budget.

The conference report reflects a dramatic 11-percent reduction from the previous year spending in foreign aid. Despite this reduction we maintain our commitment to the Middle East peace process by fully funding the Camp David Accord countries. In addition, the conferees have added language which updates and strengthens funding to the P.L.O. and demonstrates our desire that the P.L.O. continue to be engaged constructively and responsibly in the peace process.

House conferees also accepted language which allows for a one time lift-

ing of the prohibition against military aid to Pakistan. I voted in favor of this language because it has been demonstrated to me that the weapons in question will not alter the military balance in the region. In addition, the administration believes this language will facilitate an improvement in United States-Pakistan relations.

However, I believe the spread of nuclear weapons, particularly in regions of heightened ethnic tensions, represents the post-cold-war world's most profound security concern. I want to make quite clear that I will not support any future arms sales or arms transfers to Pakistan. And I am pleased the managers added, at my request, a reporting requirement on non-proliferation and conventional force reduction in all of south Asia. I think this kind of report will aid us in making future policy decisions about the area.

In order to meet the 7-year commitment to a balanced budget, it is clear that we will have to continue to reduce the size of this bill. We must resist the temptation to try and fund all programs at diminished levels and continue the process begun in this bill, to prioritize and fund what works and zero out what does not work, no matter how well meaning or high sounding the program may be.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the House that we are well represented in conference by Chairman CALLAHAN and Mr. WILSON. They pressed hard to maintain House positions. Most importantly, Mr. CALLAHAN fought hard to keep this bill's spending as low as possible. They and the subcommittee staff; Charlie Flickner, Bill Inglee, John Shank, Nancy Tippins, Kathleen Murphy, and Terry Peel, did an excellent job in getting us to this point.

Foreign aid is not something for which you look forward to voting. But this is a good responsible bill and I urge the House to accept it and then to reaffirm its commitment to banning the use of taxpayer dollars to fund worldwide abortion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill and urge its approval. I want to commend Chairman CALLAHAN and the distinguished ranking member, Mr. WILSON, for their diligent work in crafting a very responsible bill within tight budgetary constraints.

I am pleased to note that the conferees have provided the full funding level of \$56,250,000 for the U.S. contribution to the North American Development Bank created under the NAFTA agreement. Because the NADBank is a new player in the international capital markets, obtaining

full funding was critical to ensuring the Bank's financial strength and ultimately, its success. I want to point out that it is the one development bank that will directly assist U.S. citizens.

While the NADBank's primary focus will be on financing environmental infrastructure projects along the United States-Mexico border, it will also help individuals and businesses throughout the United States make adjustments to ever-changing global trade realities. The Bank's Community Adjustment and Investment Program [CAIP] is designed to address NAFTA related trade dislocation issues.

To that degree, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this will enhance the ability of workers, whether they are in Kenosha or somewhere in Seattle or Texas or California, to adjust to any job losses that are brought about by the NAFTA process.

In conference, I recommended that additional statutory and report language be included to limit and further define the direction of the CAIP. The language adopted by the conferees was intended to ensure that the implementation of the CAIP closely adheres to legislative intent. It was further intended to address a number of concerns that were raised by the conferees regarding eligibility criteria, personnel and operating expenses, and administrative accountability.

Specifically, the language regarding personnel and operating expenses was intended to ensure that the NADBank serve not simply as a pass-through for existing Federal programs, but that it fully utilize its authority to make loans and loan guarantees directly. The use of such authority by the Bank is clearly conveyed in both the implementing legislation and statement of administrative intent. The language adopted by the conferees acknowledges the authority of the Bank to utilize existing Federal loan and loan guarantee programs to implement the CAIP. However, failure by the Bank to utilize its direct lending authority would constitute noncompliance with congressional intent.

The language was further intended to ensure that the agencies involved in implementing the CAIP only assess the Bank reasonable and minimal administrative fees directly associated with processing of the loans or guarantees. Nor should a disproportionate amount of the Bank's budget for direct loans be used for administrative expenses. The Bank was never intended to supplement existing Federal credit programs and should itself be frugal in setting overhead costs.

The language adopted by the conferees regarding accountability was intended to ensure that the NADBank make the final determination regarding both CAIP eligibility and endorsement of projects for financing. It further recommends that each project should be endorsed for financing on a case-by-case basis. The language was intended to prevent Federal agencies from leveraging CAIP funds through credit programs that are not specifically tailored through guidelines developed by the NADBank to assist communities with foreign trade-induced economic impact. Finally, by recommending that projects be endorsed for

financing on a case-by-case basis, the conferees wish to prevent any blanket endorsement of loans or loan guarantees made by participating agencies. Instead, it expects each loan or loan guarantee recommended for financing to be carefully evaluated by the NADBank to ensure compliance with its eligibility criteria.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] who is a member of our committee, and who is quiet but he is strong in his convictions and he is a tremendous complement to our effort.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and thank him for those kind comments. I will pay back by saying that I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done an outstanding and remarkable job at being the compromiser in the final minutes and all the way through, but especially in the final moments.

I also want to pay tribute to the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. WILSON], because I truly think this committee has done a great deal to work together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this conference report which reflects the careful crafting by the House and Senate conferees. Balancing fiscal restraint and the needs of foreign policy, H.R. 1868 reflects the reasoned compromise and considerable cooperation that took place between the two bodies. It deserves bipartisan support. H.R. 1868 recognizes the fiscal situation we face and reduces the amount of money we spend on foreign assistance. But H.R. 1868 also reflects our continued belief in the importance of maintaining our role as a leader in global events.

This bill does not blindly slash foreign aid. We make serious cuts that reflect careful consideration and the review of every program. We have eliminated and reduced funding to those programs that have failed to justify continued support. This conference report is below the Foreign Operations Subcommittee 602(b) allocation. This bill will help us move towards a balanced budget.

Foreign aid is a crucial component of our foreign policy. The United States has a direct interest in promoting the expansion of capitalism and democracy throughout the world. Accordingly, I feel it is beneficial to American interests to aid countries which have shown a commitment to the ideals of free enterprise and individual freedom.

With the end of the cold war, there exists a sentiment in our country to place foreign affairs on the back burner and focus on domestic problems. We cannot ignore the domestic problems of crime, health care, education, and the economy, but I believe that recent events in the former Soviet Union, North Korea, and Bosnia illustrate

that America must not insulate itself from the international community.

Faced with a national debt that is strangling our economy, Congress is operating under severe pressure to reduce spending and rightfully so. I am very committed to reducing the deficit, lowering taxes, and empowering individuals and business by reducing the size and scope of our Federal Government. But we must work toward these goals as the world's only superpower and the greatest proprietor of democracy. We have reduced foreign aid in this bill but we have not eliminated our ability to participate in the world.

Foreign aid which makes up less than 1 percent of our Federal budget is a good investment and has benefited our interests around the globe by furthering the development of economic and political stability in the international community.

H.R. 1868 allows us to continue to remain active in world events while it reflects our budgetary constraints. This conference report reflects the joint work of the House and Senate. I support this conference report very strongly and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place a statement in the RECORD concerning administration policy.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The information referred to follows:

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, October 31, 1995.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1868—foreign operations, export financing and related programs appropriations bill, fiscal year 1996—Sponsors: Livingston, Louisiana; Callahan, Alabama)

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the item reported in disagreement by the conference on H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 1996. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The conferees have reported in disagreement provisions related to population assistance to non-governmental organizations. This is an issue of the highest importance to the Administration.

The Administration opposes coercion in family planning practices, and no U.S. assistance is used to pay for abortion as a method of family planning. The House provision, however, would prohibit any assistance from being provided to entities that fund abortions or lobby for abortions with private funds, thus ending U.S. support for many qualified and experienced non-governmental organizations providing vital voluntary family planning information and services. The provision would also end U.S. support for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). This would sharply limit the availability of effective voluntary family planning programs abroad that are designed to reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancy and thereby decrease the need for abortion. The Administration also has serious concerns about the constitutionality of the House provision.

If the House language were included in the bill presented to the President, the Secretary of State would recommend to the President that he veto the bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I add my congratulations to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for crafting what I think is a good bill under very difficult circumstances.

However, I rise to continue to express my sharp opposition to a provision in the conference report that would rewrite current United States law by severely weakening section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which prohibits direct United States Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockade of Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, I successfully offered an amendment on this issue on June 29, and the House approved it after 2½ hours of debate. The Senate also refused to include any language on section 907. Unfortunately, the conference committee, acting without a mandate by either the House or the Senate, decided to reinsert this provision into the bill; and I am strongly opposed to their actions in this matter.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has suggested, correctly, that his language is different, correctly, as a matter of form, not of substance. The substance of the issue is to prohibit direct payments to the Government of Azerbaijan until they remove the blockade. That is the essence of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the sanctions on Azerbaijan were imposed because of that country's ongoing blockade. When the Azerbaijan blockade is lifted, the United States prohibition on direct Government assistance can also be lifted. Countries that violate the conditions that Congress attaches for receiving U.S. assistance should not be rewarded.

□ 1630

Any attempt to remove section 907 must be viewed as support for Azerbaijan's blockade of Armenia as a legitimate weapon of war as well as support for their hostile position in the ongoing peace negotiations.

In closing, if we allow American dollars to flow to the Government of Azerbaijan, we will be turning our backs on the people of Armenia at a time when they desperately need and deserve our support. The true facts of this case are simple. The Government of Azerbaijan should act in peace, lift the blockade, and everyone can be made whole.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, seldom is a freshman Member appointed to the Committee on Appropriations, but even more seldom is it possible for a freshman Member of Congress to grasp the complexity of the appropri-

tions procedure. But, the gentleman from Long Island, NY [Mr. FORBES] is one who has done both. His insistence as a promoter of the Middle East peace process, his concern about Mr. Arafat and the distribution of the moneys to Mr. Arafat, I think, is a very strong compliment to his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES].

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of respect, obviously, for the finished product, but also I must express a grave reservation and concern that I have.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of Leon Klinghoffer, and the events of the *Achille Lauro*. I rise in memory of the young woman from New Jersey and the young woman from Connecticut and so many Americans and Israelis who died at the hands, at the bloody hands of Chairman Arafat.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues that I rise today because I am extremely concerned. I am concerned because the taxpayers of the United States of America are going to be asked over the next 5 years to spend \$500 million to help Chairman Arafat build infrastructure in accord with the Oslo Agreement for Peace in the Middle East.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that Mr. Arafat, through non-compliance, systematic noncompliance, through a lack of accountability and because of his transparency in perhaps trying to talk the talk, but not walk the walk of the Middle East peace accord, is really disingenuous in this process.

I am concerned that the taxpayers of this Nation are going to be asked to funnel \$500 million to Chairman Arafat when, in fact, the PLO has not amended provisions of its charter which declare Israel to be illegitimate and calls for its elimination through armed struggle. The PLO has not legally banned terrorist organizations such as Hamas and the Islamic Jihad, and has done very little to discipline them.

Mr. Speaker, the PLO has failed to prevent incitement to violence and, in fact, PLO officials continue to advocate holy war against Israel. These are not the activities of a peacemaker. I must rise in strong concern for funneling of this taxpayer money, this U.S. taxpayer money to Chairman Arafat and the PLO.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the State Department made a backdoor deal in extending the Middle East Peace Facilities Act 18 months. So we are now pushing accountability 18 months out so that the Middle East peace accord could perhaps move forward. But some of us believe so that for political considerations, we can move this whole issue beyond the next Presidential election. I find that abhorrent. I find the fact that we are now going to say

they must be accountable in 18 months, as opposed to 12 months, wrong.

Moving this accountability from 12 to 18 months is wrong, as it is wrong not to require Chairman Arafat to live up to the Oslo accords before he gets one thin dime from the United States taxpayers.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is important to be able to discuss this appropriations bill with an eye toward appreciating some of the very hard work that went into the ultimate bill that we now have before us. I do want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] for working with me on some very important crucial issues.

Mr. Speaker, let me view the cup as being at least half full, inasmuch as we were gratified that in this bill that has cut foreign appropriations to the bone, almost, to be able to support a valuable program, the African Development Foundation, with my amendment on the floor of \$11.5 million.

This, to the American people, I would say, is a constructive utilization of our dollars, because it relates to the grassroots that would be working with grassroots in Africa, teaching them and teaching the various nations and instructing them in how to produce, how to create jobs, and how to create income.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that that support was given, and I think the American people will find that though they have concerns about foreign appropriations, that this is well and a good investment.

Mr. Speaker, I do have, however, extreme concern about another bipartisan effort that I can proudly say was supported by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON].

I think it was supported in that context because they recognized that the American people say other things as well. They do understand that as moneys are appropriated for foreign aid, it is important that the values of this Nation, though we do not handicap our international friends, that we, in fact, do not abandon them and leave missing our values; our values of justice, social justice and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, we attempted to respond to those concerns expressed by many Ethiopian citizens in this Nation. Ethiopia is a great nation with a great history going through periods of great turmoil. Rather than to strap that leadership, we applauded what

progress has been made, but we also acknowledged that human rights should be respected and that there should be a practice that would exclude or ensure the stopping of firing university professors because of their beliefs; that we should stop imprisoning journalists and magazine editors; that we should release Dr. Asrat Woldeyes, a surgeon, a champion of human rights; that officials of the previous Government should not be sitting in prison; and that the military must be integrated to include all the people of Ethiopia.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] had the opportunity to visit Ethiopia and remarked that there were great concerns that he saw that needed to be addressed. It is unfortunate that the very moderate language that we had included to save lives and to enhance the efforts already being made in Ethiopia, that someone and somehow in this conference saw fit to make many steps backward for human rights and not allow that language to go forward as it relates to Ethiopia.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that I am very pleased with the assistance and the recognition of this issue by both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], recognizing that it is important that the State Department be forever vigilant on these issues and that the American people would not want us to abandon our dollars and not provide our values.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield just a moment to the gentleman from Alabama to engage in a colloquy on this issue. I appreciate the work of the gentleman.

I note in the conference report that it says the managers expect the Department of State to continue to be attentive to this important issue as it relates to the monitoring of Ethiopia's human rights progress. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he could help me to understand that we are going to view this in a very serious manner, recognizing that there are some great needs of improvement in Ethiopia and also acknowledging their progress.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I agree with her. And in deference to her concern about Ethiopia, I offered the amendment, along with the gentlewoman, to include it in the House bill. But, when it got to the Senate, they had 192 changes and in this compromise they requested, as did the administration, it be taken out.

So, in a spirit of compromise we took it out. But to ensure and to protect the views of the gentlewoman, we did insert the strongest protection we could put in there saying that the managers expect the Department of State to continue to be attentive to this important issue and we as managers of this bill

will certainly express to the administration our continued support accordingly.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that and I take from the gentleman's statement that that will mean a continuing monitoring by the State Department of Ethiopia. I request that the State Department provide us with continuous reports. It is an important issue, although we encourage the progress that may have been made in Ethiopia we should never abandon the human rights issue.

Mr. Speaker, I do understand the spirit of compromise. I would have hoped that we would not have compromised on the back of human rights causes, but I thank the gentleman from Texas as well for his help and I look forward to the monitoring of human rights in Ethiopia on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, I must rise to express my concern about this foreign operations appropriations conference committee report. I am concerned that the conferees decided to strike an amendment to the House version that would require the State Department "to closely monitor and take into account human rights progress in Ethiopia as it obligates funds for fiscal year 1996."

FURTHER HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN ETHIOPIA

Mr. Speaker, Ethiopia is a great nation with a rich history. Recently, it has gone through periods of turmoil and unrest. It should be U.S. policy to bolster this nation and to monitor the actions of the new government.

We should all be pleased that there have been elections in Ethiopia. However, we must be diligent in ensuring that the new government does not follow the same path of the many governments that have preceded it.

Human rights must be respected.

Stop the practice of firing university professors because of their beliefs. Many of these professors have been educated in the United States and have strong ties to this country.

Stop imprisoning journalists and magazine editors.

Release Dr. Asrat Woldeyes. He is a surgeon in who has championed human rights and is a prisoner of conscience. The people of Ethiopia are suffering because he cannot provide health care services while he is detained.

Officials of the previous government are still sitting in prison and have not yet been charged.

The military must be integrated. Right now, the military is comprised of primarily only one minority ethnic group. It is a military of elites.

This issue will not die. If it is not contained in this bill, we will have to insert this language in future bills.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on International Relations, I had an opportunity to read recent statements by Yasser Arafat regarding Israel and the peace process. Some of the statements that I read were hair raising, to say the least.

He talked about things that fly in the face of the peace accords. He talked about war and torture and retribution. All of these things are not harmonious with the peace accords that we are talking about in the Middle East.

We extended in this legislation the accountability factor by 18 months. There really is no more accountability for Yasser Arafat to contend with for the next 18 months, and yet we are going to give him \$500 million of American taxpayers' money—\$500 million.

Mr. Speaker, while we are giving him this money we realize or know or believe from British intelligence that the PLO has between \$8 and \$12 billion in Swiss bank accounts and other bank accounts around the world. Eight billion dollars to twelve billion dollars, and we are giving them \$500 million for infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, while we are doing this, there was a murder committed. The security forces for the PLO in Jericho took an American citizen, 52-year-old Azem Musllh, an American citizen. They took him out of a restaurant and took him to a jail. His wife went to get him out of jail and they said he was not there. She came back a second time and they said she would have to come back the next day.

Mr. Speaker, when she came back, he was dead. They said he died of a heart attack. When they saw the body, his jaw was broken. He had lacerations on his face. He had burns on the bottoms of his feet that looked like cigarette burns. The man had been literally tortured to death.

Mr. Speaker, this is an American citizen of Palestinian descent. Yet, we are going ahead and giving Yasser Arafat, even though he has talked against the peace process in some of his speeches, we are giving him an 18-month extension, \$500 million, and there has been no accountability as far as this man's life has been concerned.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill provides \$75 million; not \$500 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the \$500 million is the long-term agreement.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, but this bill is \$75 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, \$75 million is the first tranche. Does the gentleman disagree that he is going to get \$500 million?

Mr. BERMAN. I think it should depend on what happens and how he performs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if he agrees it is going to be \$500 million?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, no, I do not. I agree this bill has \$75 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the long-term agreement is a \$500 million bill. While the bill has a lot of merit, this is one thing with which I take issue.

Mr. Speaker, before we give them one dime, there should be complete accountability about this man's death and those who tortured him and murdered him, who are members of the security forces of the PLO, should be brought to justice before \$1 of taxpayers' money should go to the PLO.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has 14 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] reluctantly.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for reluctantly yielding me 4 minutes to discuss the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in starting out that this is a good bill which I intend to vote for, but it has two points which I think are bad and which I would like to address at this point.

First of all, with regard to aid to Azerbaijan, which I talked about previously under the rule, I am hopeful that if this bill is vetoed by the President, and it does come back to conference, that there will be an opportunity in conference to address the issue of aid to Azerbaijan again.

□ 1645

I know the gentleman from Texas has in fact submitted slightly different language from what was rejected by the House. However, the substance of the language is the same. And basically what the language does is allow direct American Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] previously pointed out that the difference in the language, the way he sees it, is essentially that now, unlike before, the aid can go strictly to refugees, does not include democracy building, and basically allows the President to determine whether the aid is appropriate. But I would submit that when we had the debate on the floor back in June on the old language, it was understood and it was part of the debate that it was understood that we were talking about humanitarian aid to refugees, that we understood that the President would make a determination as to whether or not this aid would be given

to Azerbaijan. So essentially there really is no difference here. The language is substantively the same.

The reason why those of us are opposed to this aid to Azerbaijan is because a decision was made with section 907 of the Freedom Support Act that it was wrong for Azerbaijan to continue its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. That blockade continues. There has not been and cannot be a certification by the President that the blockade is over or that any progress has been made to end it. And so it is inappropriate for us at this point to simply reward the Azerbaijan Government which continues the blockade of Armenia by saying that we are going to give you some direct government assistance.

It is also true that through non-governmental organizations aid does go to the Azerbaijan refugees for humanitarian purposes. They are receiving that. I am just hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill comes back to conference we can address this again because we did not have an opportunity today.

The other bad point in the legislation refers to assistance to Pakistan. I object to the language that permits the transfer of seized military equipment to the Government of Pakistan. This provision was not part of the House-passed bill. I am concerned that this language would undermine our Nation's commitment to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, will heighten regional instability in South Asia. And, as the New York Times stated recently in an editorial, send the wrong message to Pakistan. Why should we be rewarding Pakistan with \$370 million worth of conventional weaponry when Pakistan deliberately lied to the United States about its nuclear program.

It is important to remember that Pakistan has not agreed to do anything in exchange for the release of the seized equipment and the language in the conference report imposes no new conditions on Pakistan. In 1993, President Clinton offered to return all or a portion of the weapons if Pakistan would agree to cap its nuclear program but Pakistan rejected this offer. This language should not be in the bill.

Having noted those two bad points or two bad provisions in the bill or mentioning them, I did want to thank the chairman and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and others for including some provisions in the conference report that are very favorable to Armenia. There is an \$85 million earmark for Armenia. There is the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which we have been pushing for a long time. There is also the transcaucasian enterprise fund which is recalculated. I would be supportive of the bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, lest someone be confused about what is in this bill and what is not, there is no money and I repeat, no money anywhere in this bill that is earmarked for the PLO, for Mr. Arafat or anyone else in that regard. And we insisted upon that.

Included in the bill also, it says, new accountability number one, "New language which states that in providing assistance to Palestinians living under the jurisdiction of the Palestinian authority the beneficiaries of such assistance should be held to the same standard of financial accountability and management control as any other recipient of United States assistance."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it from talking to the gentleman, the President has discretion on the \$75 million.

Mr. CALLAHAN. The President has discretion on nearly \$600 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, and that money will go forward for infrastructure for the PLO?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we give that discretion to the President. They have earmarked some of that Economic Support Fund for Israel. They did earmark some of it in the Senate for Egypt, and we accepted those amendments. The balance of it, as it has been, I suppose, since the Economic Support Fund was established, is left to the discretion of the administration. If the administration wants to do it, yes, they can. But they have to do it under the guidelines and some of the accountability provisions that we have put in here at the gentleman's insistence.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate the accountability features that he has put in there. The fact of the matter is, the administration supports strongly the peace process, as we do and as I do. So that money will go forward.

My point is, and I know the gentleman can put a hold on this money if he sees fit, as some others may, I hope that he will do everything in his power to get accountability for this American that was murdered.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I will do everything in my power to insist on accountability. I will do everything in my power to insist that the administration does not give the PLO anything. But I just want this body to be fully aware that there is nothing earmarked, as two previous speakers have indicated, for the PLO in this bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time.

There are a number of points I would like to make. I rise in strong support of the bill and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. If you oppose the Smith amendment, like I do, understand the Smith amendment is not part of this conference report. The Smith amendment will be debated after the adoption of the conference report. I have strong feelings in opposition to that amendment, and I will express them at the time that the Smith amendment is up. My colleagues can vote for this report. If they vote for this report, they will not be voting for the Smith amendment.

The second point with respect to the administration and the veto, should the Smith amendment be adopted, it is not quite that simple. The Senate has taken a contrary position. The reason the Smith amendment is not in the conference report is because the Senate thought it was wrong to stop all funding of UNFPA and to stop funding for any voluntary family planning organizations. They realized that that action will contribute to a greater number of abortions rather than reduce the number of abortions. If the Senate does not agree with the Smith amendment, this bill will not even get to the President.

Third, this is a funny bill in a way. I am strongly in support of it because it does not cut foreign assistance as much as some would have wanted it to. The fact is, thanks to the work of certain Members on the other side, the efforts of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to reduce this function by \$5 billion were thwarted. While I believe this bill is not commensurate in terms of its funding with what should be America's role in the world and, while I am concerned that this bill will leave the United States as the least foreign assistance contributor of any other industrialized country in the world as a percentage of gross national product, the fact is this bill, given the context of the year we are in, given what others wanted to do, provides enough assistance, I think, to continue the merits of the program. I support it.

The bill is significantly above what the bill was when it left the House. The bill provides more for the very important international financial institutions account and particularly IDA, to help the lowest income people than it did when it left the House.

The bill provides special programs for children and earmarks. One of the few earmarks in the bill is \$484 million of bilateral economic assistance for programs aimed at child survival and disease. The bill fully funds Israel and Egypt. It would be a tragedy at this time in the peace process for us to do anything that would diminish America's historic support for Israel's security as it enters into this peace process. I am very happy to say that the bill fully funds that aid.

One feature of the peace process, which this bill recognizes, I am no fan

of the PLO. I am no fan of the way they have handled a variety of things. I have no doubt that there are aspects of the governance of the Palestinian authority that violate the human rights and liberties of the people living in the areas it now controls. The one thing I know is this peace process cannot succeed if the life of the individual who resides in the Gaza Strip or in the West Bank is not improved. The \$75 million in this bill will help to make that happen. It supports the peace process. I think it should be supported.

The bill has some features I do not like. As I indicated, I would rather see a higher level of overall funding. We are significantly below the administration's request. We are significantly below last year's level of funding. While I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], my friend, and a great deal of respect for his perspectives on these issues, and I like him quite a bit, I do disagree with his conclusions on two areas of the bill, Armenia and Pakistan.

I think the effort to economically strangle the small country, when we allow assistance to go to Azerbaijan, one of the participants in that strangulation, I am afraid we remove a leverage point to stop that from happening.

I also think the consequence of some of these arms shipments to Pakistan that will be allowed by this bill, my fear is, will reignite and accelerate an arms race in the South Asian Peninsula. Believe me, the Government of India will be here looking for compensatory treatment with additional arms. Pakistanis will be back. There will be economic pressures from our defense contractors to provide those arms. My fear is that an already dangerous situation in the South Asian Peninsula will be accelerated. Notwithstanding those disagreements, there is very little question in my mind that this bill deserves our support, and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of committee for yielding time to me.

This is a very good piece of work. It is the first foreign operations funding bill that I will support. We are cutting our foreign operations funding by a significant amount, 11 percent. If every part of government cut to that level, we would balance our budget in a very quick hurry in this place.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman CALLAHAN. This is his first year as chairman. He has done a super job.

It has been a real pleasure to work with the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

WILSON]. I am sorry to see that this will be his last term to serve, but it has been a real pleasure to work with him. He is a real expert on foreign affairs, and it has been a pleasure to work with him.

I compliment the work of the committee. I am proud to be able to serve on it because we have put out a good product, one that the Congress should pass overwhelmingly and send to the President.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations, I rise to express my concern and disappointment over several provisions of the foreign operations appropriations bill.

It is unfortunate that while Congress continues to spend heavily on weapons of destruction, funding is being slashed for constructive programs which generate international goodwill and help make poor countries more self-sufficient. I have had the opportunity to visit Africa on many occasions and have seen first-hand the positive results produced by the Development Fund for Africa.

Vital programs help address the scourge of hunger, illiteracy, and poverty. In fact, through foreign aid provided by American and other countries, the death rate for children under 5 has been cut in half.

Now, three accounts, including the Development Fund for Africa, have been combined and funded at a level which is \$450 million less than last year's level and less than the President's request.

The measure also cuts \$9 million from the President's request for the Agency for International Development, which administers U.S. foreign economic and humanitarian assistance programs in more than 100 countries throughout the developing world. I believe these cuts are counterproductive and fail to live up to America's tradition of humanitarian assistance to the people of struggling nations.

On the issue of Haiti, I am determined to see democracy succeed in that nation. I visited Haiti many times during the effort to reinstate President Aristide. I had the opportunity to talk with ordinary citizens of Haiti who are excited that at last they are in control of their country's destiny. I think it is important that impartial observers be sent to Haiti to monitor elections and determine the fairness of the process.

Other items in this bill which I find disturbing are the \$15 million cut in the Peace Corps budget, \$2 million cut in peacekeeping efforts, and \$1 million reduction for the Trade and Development agency.

Let me add that I was also disappointed, as one who is deeply concerned about human rights in Northern

Ireland, that the conference report does not require that U.S. assistance be provided only to those who comply with the McBride principles which protect religious minorities. The fund was also cut below the \$30 million the President requested to a level of \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need for fiscal responsibility, but I believe that it is in America's best interest to invest globally. These cuts are short-sighted and will undermine America's stature internationally.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the foreign operations appropriations conference report.

□ 1700

Let me finally add that I was also disappointed, as one who is deeply concerned about human rights in Northern Ireland, that the conference report does not require that United States assistance be provided only to those who comply with the McBride principles which protect religious minorities. The fund was cut below \$30 million; the President requested to a level of \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need for fiscal responsibility, but I believe that it is in America's best interest to invest globally. These cuts are short-sighted and will undermine America's stature internationally. I urge my colleagues to oppose the foreign operations cuts.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], who is a member of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for yielding this time to me, thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and the subcommittee staff for all their hard work on this vital bill. We worked together to protect aid to our friends like Turkey, one of our most important and loyal NATO allies. Although this bill cuts over \$1.6 billion from last year, it does retain important programs like child survival, peace programs for the Middle East, and military financing for our allies. Foreign aid promotes U.S. national interests and gives the President the diplomatic tools necessary before resorting to any military force.

I am proud to support this bill, and I think it moves us forward in being the key player in the world, and I think that we have done a terrific job with the limited resources we have to maintain that role.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I urge the passage of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have only one other request for time; that is

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], and he is not here, so, with that, I will agree to close.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this is the best bill we can get. It cuts spending. It gives the administration the flexibility that they need to have an effective foreign policy, and I would encourage an "aye" vote on this.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a provision in the foreign operations appropriations for fiscal year 1996 conference report that weakens current law prohibitions on direct aid to Azerbaijan.

During conference, a provision was added that will weaken section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, prohibiting direct government-to-government assistance between the United States and Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockade of Armenia.

This provision was stripped from the House version of this bill after a lengthy floor debate that went on for over 2½ hours. In recognition of the House's firm action on this matter, the Senate opted not to include similar language in their version. The disregard of the will of both the House and Senate on this matter by the conferees is simply unacceptable.

Until the devastating blockade being imposed on Armenia by its hostile neighbor Azerbaijan is lifted, we cannot afford to compromise our principles by relaxing restrictions under section 907 to allow aid to Azerbaijan. The Government of Azerbaijan has taken no steps to lift the blockade or even allowed the transport of humanitarian aid to Armenia through its borders. Given these facts, I firmly believe that a change in the law is unwarranted.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the provision lifting the ban on direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan, as long as Azerbaijan continues its brutal blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh.

Just 4 months ago the House of Representatives passed the Visclosky amendment with overwhelming support. The Visclosky amendment would continue the current ban on direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan, as long as Azerbaijan continues its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh. The Visclosky amendment did not forbid humanitarian assistance to the people of Azerbaijan, only direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan.

How can it be, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report provides direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan, when this House overwhelmingly rejected such aid, and the Senate bill preserved the current ban? I will tell my colleagues the simple truth of the matter, as I did when the House debated the Visclosky amendment 4 months ago. It is greed, simple greed. It is the oil of Azerbaijan, and the desire of some to profit from that oil by helping the Government of Azerbaijan to build the infrastructure to extract and transport that oil.

Since 1992 the United States has said that the Government of Azerbaijan will not receive direct United States aid as long as Azerbaijan continues its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh. This blockage has prevented the delivery of assistance to 300,000

Armenian refugees and obstructed the rebuilding of earthquake damage which left 500,000 people in Armenia homeless. The blockade by the Government of Azerbaijan has cut off the transport of food, fuel, medicine and other humanitarian assistance to the people of Armenia. Unless and until Azerbaijan removes its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh and stops its oppressive conduct toward the Armenian people, the United States should continue to forbid direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan.

I strongly supported the Visclosky amendment when it was before the House 4 months ago. The House spoke clearly on this issue by passing the Visclosky amendment with overwhelming support. I joined with many of my colleagues in the House and wrote to the members of the conference committee to urge them to preserve the Visclosky amendment. I also wrote to the chairman of the Rules Committee in support of the Visclosky amendment. I deeply regret that the rule accompanying the conference report protects a provision lifting the ban on direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, in this time of crisis the people of Armenia need our strong support. As long as the Government of Azerbaijan continues to strangle the Armenian people by this blockade, the United States should stand resolute and firm in the position that we will not provide assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report on Foreign Operations Appropriations for FY 1996 (H.R. 1868). This bipartisan legislation passed the House last July 11 on a vote of 333 to 89 and passed the Senate on September 21 by a vote of 91 to 9. The overall bill appropriates \$202 million more than the House bill, but \$2.7 billion less than President Clinton's request and \$1.5 billion less than the fiscal year 1995 appropriations level.

As our Nation's only democratic ally in the region, it is important for the United States to continue to play a role in assisting Israel's fight against terrorism, radicalism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It should be noted that this assistance is of help not only to Israel, but 70 percent of the aid is spent in the United States, and thus creates new jobs, economic expansion and opens up new markets for United States exports. While being ever mindful of ways to find efficiencies within the Federal budget, the foreign operations budget consist of less than 1 percent of the Federal budget and yet helps create nearly 1 million domestic jobs.

I also want to take time to congratulate both the House and Senate for its leadership and swiftness in overwhelming passage of S. 1322, The Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Implementation Act of 1995. With over 180 United States Embassies around the world, only Israel has been denied the right to have its American Embassy located in its capital city. While Jerusalem is a holy city for three major world religions and home to thousands of religious worshippers, the state of Israel has never denied people of any faith from worshiping in Jerusalem. Now that the peace process is progressing, relocating the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem will hopefully strengthen that peace process.

Israel has been a trustworthy ally in a troubled and unstable region of the world, and it is my view that passage of these two bipartisan bills will help the United States reconfirm its strong commitment to Israel, to human rights, and to peace.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, it is with truly mixed emotions that I today will vote in support of this conference report.

There is much in this report that is good, and for the most part of those measures which prompted me to support the bill when it was on the House floor remain.

This bill continues our historic and important commitment to advancing peace in the Middle East. Israel is our strongest ally and is the only democracy in an unstable, volatile, and important region.

The American people have been partners with Israel in difficult days, and today as the prospects for peace appear more promising, we must continue to be a steadfast ally.

This bill also makes important refinements in the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, toughening standards that apply to actions by the PLO.

As well, this bill includes several provisions which continue our commitment to support the people of Armenia. I applaud the inclusion of the earmark for Armenia, the cap on aid to Turkey, and the inclusion of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Relief Act.

These are good provisions. The United States must be beside the people of Armenia in their struggle against aggressors.

Unfortunately, the conference ignored the will of the House on section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. After two and a half hours of debate, on June 29 the House voted to maintain a strong Freedom Support Act and says to Azerbaijan, that we will not give you aid until you end your unjust blockade of Armenia.

This was right then. And it is right today.

What is wrong, in fact unconscionable, is to have Conferees turn their back on the expressed will of the House.

Democracy is based upon the simple idea that votes matter, that when people freely express what they believe, and the majority speaks, that they will be heard. By ripping the heart out of the Freedom Support Act, the conference report cavalierly said that votes do not stand for anything.

This back room deal is beneath this Congress. As people in struggling democracies look to us to set an example, it is tragic that we set such a poor example in the very bill that defines how we relate to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill. I support much that is in it, but deplore what has been added and how that was done.

Those of us—and I remind you that it is the majority of us—who believe in a strong Freedom Support Act, will take our fight to another day.

We will not give up.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, Chechnya has entered the stage of a precarious balance between war and peace, one which is likely to continue for some time. The peace negotiations are currently deadlocked. The discussion of political issues, including the status of Chechnya, is supposed to take place once the

military agreements have been implemented. However, the key military elements of the cease-fire agreement—the decommissioning of Chechen weapons, the withdrawal of Russian troops and the release of prisoners—are far from complete. And given the size of the chasm that exists between the two sides on these issues, it is unlikely that the basic armistice agreements will be implemented anytime soon.

Therefore, I am very encouraged by the fact that the conference report's statement of managers calls for no more than \$195 million for aid to Russia, with the remaining \$446 million in the Newly Independent States account to be used for aid to the other republics. My amendment, which was adopted as part of the original House-passed bill, cut and then placed limits on the use of funds for Russia in response to its continued aggression in Chechnya.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the discussion of political issues is important for us to consider as we conclude our deliberations of this year's foreign aid appropriation to Russia. Relating to the issue of prisoner exchanges, Russian and Chechen negotiators in Grozny agreed initially to exchange all prisoners of war and other people forcibly detained during the conflict. However, this argument began to unravel when it became clear that the two sides could not agree on the actual number of prisoners held. With all of the charges and countercharges and confusion on both sides, it does not appear that this exchange will be resolved anytime soon.

In the area of decommissioning weaponry, the Russian-Chechen armistice agreement provisions have created a truly confusing and frustrating situation. Russian forces continue to confiscate weapons while the armistice clearly stipulated that Chechens were to be compensated for turning over their weapons. But this was not the most serious post-armistice harassment perpetrated by the Russian military. On August 19, when the decommissioning of arms began, Russian soldiers opened fire on the village of Achkhoy-Martan, killing two children. The Russian military falsely informed the media that the children had been killed by an exploding mine.

However, we should be thankful that gradually, the Chechens are gaining control over this situation. Not only are the rank and file paramilitary Chechens returning to their homes, but also the commanders for whom the Russian intelligence services continue to search. While the head of the new National Salvation government says that he controls 90 percent of the Chechen territory, their authority in fact extends over Grozny only in the daytime. At night it is reported, that their power does not extend beyond the territory of Russian troops quarters, check points and commandant's offices.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to remain mindful of the delicate balance between war and peace in Chechnya. I further urge my colleagues to be cognizant of Russia's continued presence in Chechnya when voting to provide \$195 million to the Government of Russia.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to reassess our national budgetary priorities. In the past U.S. tax dollars have fostered democracy and fought

poverty and disease throughout the world. I cannot in good conscience, however, vote for aid to foreign nations when America faces severe problems here at home. Thirty-seven million Americans lack health insurance, too many students are graduating from school unprepared to compete in the world market, and the United States is facing a huge Federal deficit. We cannot send aid to every corner of the world and also make a serious commitment to tackling our problems at home. We simply cannot afford it all, and our U.S. foreign assistance program must therefore be restructured and returned.

While I support foreign aid in instances where there is a demonstrated humanitarian need, or when U.S. national security dictates protecting strategic and regional interests, I believe that we must take a serious look at the ways in which the United States has provided aid in the past. Simple cash or military aid that does not directly foster economic growth abroad may not be in our long-term interests. We must consider restructuring our foreign aid program to emphasize expanding U.S. exports, developing future markets for our products and encouraging economic development in other countries that are important to our national security. As long as we face demanding problems here at home and fail to reform the outdated manner in which we give foreign aid, I cannot support this foreign aid bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the Conference Report on the bill H.R. 1868 to the Committee of Conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the house to: recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: : Provided, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

SEC. 518A. COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than May 1, 1996; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning activities of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physical

duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which the automatic vote by electronic device will be taken on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 245, as follows:

[Roll No. 751]

YEAS—179

Abercrombie	Ford	Meehan
Ackerman	Fowler	Meek
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Menendez
Baldacci	Franks (NJ)	Meyers
Barrett (WI)	Frelinghuysen	Mfume
Becerra	Frost	Miller (CA)
Beilenson	Furse	Minge
Bentsen	Gejdenson	Mink
Berman	Gibbons	Moran
Bishop	Gilchrest	Morella
Boehlert	Gilman	Nadler
Boucher	Gonzalez	Obey
Brown (CA)	Green	Oliver
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	Owens
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	Pallone
Bryant (TX)	Harman	Pastor
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	Payne (NJ)
Castle	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Chapman	Hilliard	Pelosi
Clay	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Clayton	Horn	Pickett
Clement	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Porter
Collins (IL)	Jefferson	Pryce
Collins (MI)	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad
Condit	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Coyne	Johnston	Richardson
Cramer	Kelly	Rivers
Danner	Kennedy (MA)	Rose
Davis	Kennedy (RI)	Roukema
DeFazio	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Klecicka	Rush
Dellums	Klug	Sabo
Deutsch	Kolbe	Sanders
Dicks	Lantos	Sawyer
Dingell	Lazio	Schiff
Dixon	Leach	Schroeder
Doggett	Levin	Schumer
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Dunn	Lincoln	Serrano
Durbin	Lofgren	Shays
Edwards	Longley	Sisisky
Ehrlich	Lowe	Skaggs
Engel	Luther	Slaughter
Eshoo	Maloney	Stark
Evans	Manton	Stokes
Farr	Markey	Studds
Fattah	Martinez	Thomas
Fazio	Martini	Thompson
Filner	Matsui	Thornton
Flake	McCarthy	Thurman
Foglietta	McDermott	Torkildsen
Foley	McKinney	Torres

Toricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Viscosky

Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wilson
Wise

Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

□ 1727

Messrs. JOHNSON of Texas, EWING, HOKE, FRANKS of Connecticut, BAESLER, and HAMILTON changed their vote for "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PAYNE of New Jersey, FRELINGHUYSEN, GILMAN, FRANKS of New Jersey, GREENWOOD, MINGE, CRAMER, DAVIS, FOLEY, KLECZKA, EHRLICH, and KOLBE, Ms. DUNN, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 71, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 752]

YEAS—351

Abercrombie	Coble	Funderburk
Ackerman	Collins (GA)	Furse
Allard	Collins (IL)	Gallely
Andrews	Combest	Ganske
Archer	Costello	Gejdenson
Armey	Cox	Gekas
Bachus	Coyne	Geren
Baessler	Cramer	Gibbons
Baker (CA)	Crane	Gilchrest
Baker (LA)	Crapo	Gillmor
Baldacci	Cremins	Gilman
Ballenger	Cubin	Gonzalez
Barcia	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Barr	Davis	Gooding
Barrett (WI)	de la Garza	Gordon
Bartlett	Deal	Goss
Barton	DeLauro	Graham
Bass	DeLay	Green
Bateman	Deutsch	Greenwood
Beilenson	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Bentsen	Dickey	Gutierrez
Bereuter	Dicks	Gutknecht
Berman	Dixon	Hall (OH)
Bevill	Doggett	Hamilton
Bilbray	Dooley	Hansen
Bilirakis	Dornan	Harman
Bishop	Doyle	Hastert
Bliley	Dreier	Hastings (FL)
Blute	Dunn	Hastings (WA)
Boehlert	Durbin	Hayworth
Boehner	Edwards	Heineman
Bonilla	Ehlers	Hilleary
Bonior	Ehrlich	Hinchey
Bono	Emerson	Hobson
Borski	Engel	Hoekstra
Boucher	English	Hoke
Brewster	Ensign	Holden
Browder	Eshoo	Horn
Brown (FL)	Evans	Hostettler
Brownback	Ewing	Hoyer
Bryant (TN)	Farr	Hunter
Burr	Fattah	Hyde
Burns	Fawell	Inglis
Burton	Fazio	Istook
Buyer	Fields (TX)	Jackson-Lee
Callahan	Filner	Jefferson
Calvert	Flake	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Flanagan	Johnson (SD)
Canady	Foglietta	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Forbes	Johnston
Chabot	Ford	Kanjorski
Chambliss	Fowler	Kasich
Chapman	Fox	Kelly
Christensen	Frank (MA)	Kennedy (MA)
Chrysler	Franks (CT)	Kennedy (RI)
Clay	Franks (NJ)	Kennelly
Clayton	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Clement	Frist	Kim
Clinger	Frost	King

NOT VOTING—8

Coleman	Moakley	Weldon (PA)
Fields (LA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
Gephardt	Tucker	

Kingston	Moorhead	Shays
Kleccka	Moran	Sisisky
Klink	Morella	Skaggs
Klug	Murtha	Skeen
Knollenberg	Myrick	Skelton
Kolbe	Nadler	Smith (MI)
LaFalce	Neal	Smith (NJ)
LaHood	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Lantos	Ney	Smith (WA)
Largent	Norwood	Solomon
Latham	Nussle	Souder
LaTourette	Oberstar	Spence
Laughlin	Obey	Spratt
Lazio	Oliver	Stenholm
Leach	Ortiz	Stokes
Levin	Orton	Studds
Lewis (CA)	Oxley	Stupak
Lewis (GA)	Packard	Talent
Lewis (KY)	Pallone	Tate
Lightfoot	Parker	Tauzin
Linder	Pastor	Taylor (NC)
Lipinski	Paxon	Tejeda
Livingston	Payne (VA)	Thomas
LoBiondo	Pelosi	Thornberry
Loftgren	Peterson (FL)	Thurman
Longley	Peterson (MN)	Tiahrt
Lowe	Petri	Torkildsen
Luther	Pickett	Torricelli
Maloney	Pomeroy	Towns
Manton	Porter	Upton
Manzullo	Portman	Vento
Markey	Poshard	Visclosky
Martini	Pryce	Vucanovich
Mascara	Quinn	Waldholtz
Matsui	Radanovich	Walker
McCarthy	Ramstad	Walsh
McCollum	Rangel	Wamp
McCrery	Reed	Ward
McDade	Regula	Waters
McDermott	Richardson	Watts (OK)
McHale	Riggs	Waxman
McHugh	Rivers	Weldon (FL)
McInnis	Rose	Weller
McIntosh	Roukema	White
McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield
McKinney	Rush	Wicker
McNulty	Sabo	Williams
Meehan	Salmon	Wilson
Meek	Sanford	Wise
Menendez	Sawyer	Wolf
Metcalfe	Schiff	Woolsey
Meyers	Schumer	Wyden
Mfume	Scott	Wynn
Mica	Seastrand	Yates
Miller (FL)	Serrano	Young (AK)
Mink	Shadegg	Zeliff
Molinaro	Shaw	Zimmer

NAYS—71

Barrett (NE)	Hefner	Rohrabacher
Becerra	Herger	Roth
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Royce
Brown (OH)	Houghton	Sanders
Bryant (TX)	Jacobs	Scarborough
Bunning	Jones	Schaefer
Chenoweth	Kaptur	Schroeder
Clyburn	Lincoln	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Lucas	Shuster
Collins (MI)	Martinez	Slaughter
Condit	Miller (CA)	Stark
Conyers	Minge	Stearns
Cooley	Mollohan	Stockman
Danner	Montgomery	Stump
DeFazio	Myers	Tanner
Dellums	Neumann	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	Owens	Thompson
Doolittle	Payne (NJ)	Thornton
Duncan	Pombo	Trafigant
Everett	Quillen	Velazquez
Hall (TX)	Rahall	Volkmer
Hancock	Roberts	Watt (NC)
Hayes	Roemer	Young (FL)
Hefley	Rogers	

NOT VOTING—10

Coleman	Moakley	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
Gephardt	Saxton	
Hutchinson	Torres	

□ 1734

Mr. DOOLITTLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RUSH and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 752, I was inadvertently detained and missed the vote for final passage of the conference report on H.R. 1868. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently detained on official business yesterday during rollcall vote No. 752, the vote for final passage of the conference report on H.R. 1868. Had I been present on the floor of the House, I would have voted "yea."

LIMITING DEBATE ON MOTION MADE IN ORDER BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 249 TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENT 115

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the motion made in order by House Resolution 249 to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 be limited to 20 minutes equally divided and controlled as otherwise provided in the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? There was no objection.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 115: Page 44, line 19, after "lizations" insert: : *Provided*, That in determining eligibility for assistance from funds appropriated to carry out section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, nongovernmental and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive than the requirements applicable to foreign governments for such assistance: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. CALLAHAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTION

Sec. 518A. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for

any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(b) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) apply to funds made available for a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee, and the required certifications apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee.

(d) COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than March 1, 1996; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 249 and the order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering a motion today that is an attempt at a compromise on the Mexico City abortion policy. Except for a technical change, it is the same as I offered in conference. Unfortunately, the Senate rejected my offer.

The original Mexico City abortion policy amendment was offered on the House floor by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, pursuant to the rule for consideration of the Foreign Operations bill.

It passed by a vote of 243 to 187. However, my compromise proposal would modify the House language in the following ways:

First, the Smith amendment as passed prohibited funding to both foreign and domestic organizations if they used non-Federal funds for abortions. The compromise would apply the funding limitation only to foreign organizations, either acting directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee.

Second, I would modify the provisions on lobbying to apply only to foreign organizations, acting in a foreign country. That would remove any hint of a constitutional problem with the amendment, as some have alleged.

Third, I would modify the language on the U.N. Population Fund to remove the funding prohibition for UNFPA if the President certifies that the organization will terminate all family planning activities in China by March 1, 1996. The agreement between the U.N. Population Fund and China expires on December 31 of this year, and this proposal would give them 2 months to phase out any carry-over activities. Frankly, if China and the U.N. Population Fund sign a new agreement, then we should terminate funding for the organization.

The modification to amendment no. 115 would also strike the Senate provision that puts into statute abortion policy that is contrary to the Mexico City policy. The language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the use of Federal funds to lobby for or against abortion would be retained.

The effect of this amendment is to return to the original Mexico City policy as practiced by the Reagan administration.

Frankly, I prefer the original House position on these matters. But I am interested in moving this conference agreement through the Congress, and I believe this proposal may be a way to do that.

I would also like to note that this motion has the support of the original sponsor of the amendment, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate his effort to work with the committee to fashion this language.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield my remaining time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama yields the remaining time that he has to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], which is 9 minutes.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the motion?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, family planning works and we should not allow differences in our domestic policy to interfere with foreign policy.

The Mexico City policy allowed our country to make effective use of our foreign aid. Reimposing the Mexico City policy will hurt countless families throughout the world and increase the number of unintended pregnancies.

Organizations like International Planned Parenthood offer basic health

care screening and information on how to plan a family. Denying United States funds to organizations like International Planned Parenthood just does not make sense. It is arbitrary denial of assistance where it is needed.

If we are serious, Mr. Speaker, about helping people not have unintended pregnancies, we should not impose the Mexico City policy. This policy works. Planned Parenthood works.

Why do we not just let the rest of the world do what they are going to do as we always do what we want to do?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to remind Members of the debate that we had not too long ago and in support of the Callahan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Fund for Population Assistance has not had a history of which it should be proud in terms of its relationship with the Chinese Government. While they may choose to say otherwise, forced abortions and sterilizations do occur in China today. When Mrs. Clinton was in China last month, she condemned this practice. We can do no less than to back her up.

Last July, I had the opportunity to hear the testimony of Chinese men and women who had fled China after having experienced either a forced abortion or sterilization. One of these women was forcibly sterilized by the Chinese Government because she had the courage to pick up an abandoned baby girl by the side of the road. By adopting this little girl, she violated her quota of children although this little girl was not her birth child. This is anti-woman, both adult and child. It is also anti-family.

As Members, we have a responsibility to speak out for these Chinese girls who are abandoned on the side of the road and placed in literal death houses where they are left to starve to death. It is time to say to the UNFPA, enough is enough. No more dancing around the issue. Americans are sick and tired of being mocked.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion before us. This motion aims to completely eliminate family planning aid overseas.

Proponents of this language claim that it simply cuts abortion funding. What they have not told you is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973. This language would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero.

Therefore, this motion goes after family planning.

The world's population is growing at an unprecedented rate. In 40 years our

planet's population will more than double. As a responsible world leader, the United States must do more to deter the environmental, political, and health consequences of this explosive growth.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile.

And let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth and unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

Each year, 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions.

Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care.

Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them.

Most of these disabilities and deaths could be prevented.

This motion would defund family planning organizations that perform legal abortions—even if the abortion services are funded with non-U.S. money.

The motion also cuts funds to the UNFPA, an organization that provides family planning and population assistance in over 140 countries. The pretext for this provision is that the UNFPA operates in China, and therefore the funding must be cut. However, the law currently states that no United States funds can be used in UNFPA's China program. Proponents of this language are clearly using the deplorable situation in China as an excuse to eliminate funding for this highly successful and important family planning organization. The UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China, and should not be held hostage to extremist anti-abortion rhetoric.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion. No matter how its proponents try to disguise it, this motion is ultimately intended to end U.S. family planning assistance overseas. A vote for this motion is a vote against sensible, cost-effective family planning programs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Callahan amendment represents a proposed compromise with the Senate on the codification of the Mexico City policy, a policy that is supported by the vast majority of the American people.

I think it is important to note that this language does nothing to reduce

U.S. funding of international family planning programs. It merely prevents taxpayer money from going to fund promotion or performance of abortion.

What we are trying to do in this amendment is to stop clouding the issue. To talk about private funds being used and no taxpayers' dollars being used is really quite deceptive. It does not really fool anybody. It is a shell game being played by these organizations. The American people do not want their taxpayer dollars being used to promote, perform, and support abortion policies around the world.

Since rescinding the Mexico City policy, the Clinton administration has committed over \$75 million to International Planned Parenthood which performs and promotes abortion as a method of family planning, and they have refused to sign because of their radicalism to the Mexico City policy.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago, women from different nations, cultures, and religions came together at the United Nations World Conference on Women, in Beijing.

At the Beijing conference, Mr. Speaker, women from around the world spoke about the need to increase access to family planning, particularly in the developing world, where an unwanted pregnancy is often a matter of life or death.

If you believe that women, rich and poor, should have the right to choose safe motherhood, you must vote down the Callahan motion. If you believe that women should have the right to choose how many children they have and under what conditions, you must vote down the Callahan motion. If you believe that the United States has the obligation to support the United Nations in its efforts to slow the Earth's exploding population, and the misery that comes with it, you must vote down the Callahan motion.

Support international family planning; support the conference report language for the foreign operations appropriations bill; vote down the Callahan motion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

□ 1745

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have said it once and I will say it again.

This debate is about more than just family planning in China or other countries. This debate is about the United States of America and a consistent policy that has been established from the beginning of this country and has been held forth until now.

But through a weakening of the commitment and the resolve to never,

never allow for public funding for abortions, especially overseas, just through the rhetoric and through a potential treaty, that consistent policy could be seriously, seriously diminished.

Even as late as 1994, the General Conference on Population and Development held in Cairo reiterated that in no case should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.

Mr. Speaker, we take great pride in the fact we have established a new vision for America and we have begun to establish a new trust for this Congress by laying out promises that were made; promises that were kept. And I think in all cases we ought to be able to say to the American people, "This is a promise that we have made and we will make it into the future; that there shall not be this kind of foreign policy that shall be initiated."

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Callahan-Smith amendment. There are those who are trying to sell this as a compromise amendment. This is not a compromise. It is one side compromising with itself.

This amendment is still terrible in its impact on the poorest of the poor women of the world. Remember our policy in this country has always been antiabortion. Not one cent of this money goes for abortions when it goes overseas.

With the Callahan-Smith amendment, it becomes antifamily planning. The key to this amendment is that no matter how sick or malnourished a woman may be, no matter that she is carrying a seriously malformed fetus, she can not have a health service, maybe in the only women's health clinic that she has access to, like others could have because they can afford to pay their doctor.

These women that we are talking about do not have the options that Americans do. They do not have the many choices of health care providers so that they can get a medically necessary abortion from another source if the woman's health organization to which we provide family planning assistance is restricted from doing so. There are NGO's, nongovernmental organizations, that simply cannot accept these conditions, because the local law forbids it.

Mr. Speaker, there are countries in this world where the only organization providing family planning is International Planned Parenthood. This would say that International Planned Parenthood could not have money. It would take us out of countries where the average number of children per woman of childbearing years is 7; the average number of children produced by a woman in her childbearing years is 7, and we are going to take out the

only family planning organization present.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Callahan amendment. One point must be reiterated in this debate—this amendment has nothing to do with abortion. Current law already prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortion. For 20 years, foreign aid policy and law has clearly stated that U.S. funds cannot be used to pay for abortion services or to lobby on the issue.

What this amendment does do is gut family planning programs—resulting in more abortions.

The Callahan amendment would deny funds to women's health organizations which use their own funds to perform abortions or lobby their governments on abortion policy. I urge my colleagues to recognize that the effect of this provision would be to kill family planning programs.

This amendment is an international gag rule. As democracy movements are opening up public involvement in policymaking throughout the world, we are seeing many private, local organizations becoming more vocal about the harsh reality of women's health. When I participated in the international women's conferences in Cairo and Beijing, I heard thousands of nongovernmental organizations speaking out, telling the world about the lack of access to decent health care in developing countries and of the obstacles women face in choosing how many children they want to have and can afford to care for. This international gag rule would inhibit these groups from providing health information to the public and prevent them from expressing concerns about women's struggles because—quite simply—they need foreign assistance to provide services.

The Callahan amendment is not a compromise because the restrictions would still impact groups throughout the world—those providers who best understand the local needs and problems. Supporters of the amendment argue that it would not impact U.S. groups, but, in fact, it will, because U.S. groups work closely with family planning partners in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge my colleagues to join in opposing the amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to point out once more, just in case there is any misunderstanding, the statement of the administration policy, that if the House language were included in the bill presented to the President, the Secretary of State would recommend to the President that he veto the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great respect for the deeply felt commitment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for their position, but in strong opposition to their proposal.

You have heard it over and over again, and I will say it again: Current law is already antiabortion. This Callahan-Smith provision only makes it antifamily planning. Existing law prohibits use of U.S. funds for abortion activities. Our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], pointed out that for 20 years there have been adequate protections in foreign aid law and policy, the Helms amendment.

The House language is extreme because it would defund organizations that provide legal health services. Legitimate and effective women's health organizations would be punished under this amendment simply for providing family planning information. The target of the House provision is the U.N. Population Fund.

Operating in 140 countries, UNFPA is the principal multilateral organization providing worldwide family planning and population assistance. UNFPA assistance is used for family planning and assistance and maternal and child care in the poorest and most remote regions of the world.

Since its founding, UNFPA has saved the lives of countless women and children. Further limitations on the U.S. contributions to UNFPA are unnecessary. No United States funds can be used in UNFPA's China program. No UNFPA funding is linked in any way to family planning abuses in China. UNFPA does not condone or cover up coercion in China. The United States Government should not, as a matter of principle, hold family planning and UNFPA hostage to the legitimate concerns we all hold and share about forced abortions in China.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, a little over 3 months ago the House voted overwhelmingly on two important pro-life policies, these antic coercion policies contained in the Callahan motion.

First, we voted to condition our support for the U.N. Population Fund on an end to UNFPA support for the forced abortion policy of the People's Republic of China. In recent months, the government-imposed nightmare of forced abortion and involuntary sterilization in China has taken yet another turn for the worse.

Mr. Speaker, the brutal one-child-per-couple policy has been around since 1979. This means quite literally that brothers and sisters are illegal.

In February of this year, the government announced a new intensified cam-

paign against women who attempt to have a child without explicit government permission. The arrogant leaders in Beijing have decreed children should not be born, so population control cadres march out in lockstep and they force abortions on these women throughout the country.

Yet, and I beg to differ with my good friend from California, the UNFPA continues to laud this program as a totally voluntary program. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be further from the truth. Dr. Sadik, from time and time again on national television and in various fora, is saying the Chinese program is voluntary. She is whitewashing, unfortunately, these heinous crimes against women and children. She has even recommended that the Chinese program be replicated and reproduced elsewhere around the world.

Unfortunately, we should be lampooning and bringing scrutiny to these terrible human rights abuses, rather than giving money to organizations that act as cheerleaders.

I was in Beijing, Mr. Speaker, when First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton gave an excellent speech on forced abortion. Unfortunately, she did not mention China, but everybody knew about whom she was talking.

We need to see the words matched with deeds. Unfortunately, rhetoric and condemnations are not enough. This kind of language, similar to what we had in effect during the Reagan and Bush years, will send a clear, unmistakable message that coercion has no place in family planning programs.

The other program or policy is the Mexico City policy, which simply seeks to erect a wall of separation between abortion and family planning. Again, the other side has suggested this is antifamily planning. Not true.

In effect since 1984, unfortunately repealed by Mr. Clinton, this program and policy sent money to groups, including International Planned Parenthood Federation affiliates who would sign on the dotted line that they would not promote abortion as a method of family planning.

If we are serious that these children who are killed by abortion have worth and are priceless and have value, it seems to me that we should be giving money only to those organizations that are truly committed to family planning and not those that have an agenda of promoting abortion globally as well as in this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me say finally, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done an excellent job in crafting, as chairman of this subcommittee, language that is a compromise. We have given in on some points. The language before us, I think, should pass muster in the Senate, and we hope that the President—maybe not the first time, but sometime in the near future—will sign this into law, because it is right. Children have value.

Family planning is not reduced by a dime. By this language, it is conditioned only to those that promote family planning and not those that promote abortion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote for this amendment, and would announce on behalf of the leadership that this will be the last vote of the evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 753]

AYES—232

Allard	Danner	Hyde
Archer	de la Garza	Inglis
Armey	Deal	Istook
Bachus	DeLay	Jacobs
Baker (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Baker (LA)	Dickey	Jones
Ballenger	Doolittle	Kanjorski
Barcia	Dornan	Kasich
Barr	Doyle	Kildee
Barrett (NE)	Dreier	Kim
Bartlett	Duncan	King
Barton	Ehlers	Kingston
Bateman	Emerson	Klecza
Bereuter	English	Klink
Bevill	Ensign	Knollenberg
Bilirakis	Everett	LaFalce
Bliley	Ewing	LaHood
Blute	Fields (TX)	Largent
Boehner	Flanagan	Latham
Bonilla	Foley	LaTourette
Bonior	Forbes	Laughlin
Bono	Fowler	Lewis (CA)
Brewster	Fox	Lewis (KY)
Browder	Frisa	Lightfoot
Brownback	Funderburk	Linder
Bryant (TN)	Gallegly	Lipinski
Bunn	Ganske	Livingston
Bunning	Geren	LoBiondo
Burr	Gillmor	Longley
Burton	Goodlatte	Lucas
Buyer	Goodling	Manton
Callahan	Goss	Manzullo
Calvert	Graham	Mascara
Camp	Gunderson	McCollum
Canady	Gutknecht	McCrery
Chabot	Hall (OH)	McDade
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Chenoweth	Hancock	McInnis
Christensen	Hansen	McIntosh
Chrysler	Hastert	McKeon
Clinger	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Coble	Hayes	Metcalf
Coburn	Hayworth	Mica
Collins (GA)	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Combest	Heineman	Molinaro
Cooley	Hergert	Montgomery
Costello	Hillery	Moorhead
Cox	Hoekstra	Myers
Crane	Hoke	Myrick
Crapo	Holden	Nethercutt
Creameans	Hostettler	Neumann
Cubin	Hunter	Ney
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Norwood

Nussle	Salmon	Tanner
Oberstar	Sanford	Tate
Ortiz	Saxton	Tauzin
Orton	Scarborough	Taylor (MS)
Oxley	Schaefer	Taylor (NC)
Packard	Seastrand	Tejeda
Parker	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Paxon	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Volkmer
Petri	Shuster	Vucanovich
Pombo	Skeen	Waldholtz
Portman	Skelton	Walker
Poshard	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Quillen	Smith (NJ)	Wamp
Quinn	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Radanovich	Smith (WA)	Weldon (FL)
Rahall	Solomon	Weller
Regula	Souder	Whitfield
Riggs	Spence	Wicker
Roberts	Stearns	Wolf
Roemer	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Rogers	Stockman	Young (FL)
Rohrabacher	Stump	Zeliff
Roth	Stupak	
Royce	Talent	

NOES—187

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Owens
Ackerman	Gilchrist	Pallone
Andrews	Gilman	Pastor
Baessler	Gonzalez	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Gordon	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Green	Pelosi
Bass	Greenwood	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Gutierrez	Pickett
Bellenson	Hamilton	Porter
Bentsen	Harman	Pryce
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hefner	Rangel
Bishop	Hilliard	Reed
Boehlert	Hinchey	Richardson
Boucher	Hobson	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Horn	Rose
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Roukema
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Cardin	Jefferson	Sabo
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Sanders
Chapman	Johnson (SD)	Sawyer
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Schiff
Clayton	Johnston	Schroeder
Clement	Kaptur	Schumer
Clyburn	Kelly	Scott
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Shays
Condit	Kennelly	Sisisky
Conyers	Klug	Skaggs
Coyne	Kolbe	Slaughter
Cramer	Lantos	Spratt
DeFazio	Lazio	Stark
DeLauro	Leach	Stokes
Dellums	Levin	Studds
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Thomas
Dicks	Lincoln	Thompson
Dingell	Lofgren	Thornton
Dixon	Lowe	Thurman
Doggett	Luther	Torkildsen
Dooley	Maloney	Torres
Dunn	Markey	Torricelli
Durbin	Martinez	Towns
Edwards	Martini	Traficant
Ehrlich	Matsui	Upton
Engel	McCarthy	Velazquez
Eshoo	McDermott	Vento
Evans	McHale	Visclosky
Farr	McKinney	Ward
Fattah	Meehan	Waters
Fawell	Meek	Watt (NC)
Fazio	Menendez	Waxman
Filmer	Meyers	White
Flake	Mfume	Williams
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wilson
Ford	Minge	Wise
Frank (MA)	Mink	Woolsey
Franks (CT)	Moran	Wyden
Franks (NJ)	Morella	Wynn
Frelinghuysen	Nadler	Yates
Frost	Neal	Zimmer
Furse	Obey	
Gejdenson	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—13

Borski	Fields (LA)	Moakley
Coleman	Gekas	
Davis	Gephardt	

□ 1818

So the motion was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for rollcall No. 753, the motion to recede and concur on H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1996. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-300)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1977) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 21, 24, 26, 40, 54, 57, 67, 77, 83, 85, 94, 99, 100, 105, 107, 111, 117, 118, 123, 136, 138, 147, 148, 155, 163, 166, 169, 171, 172, and 173.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 56, 59, 61, 62, 66, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 86, 87, 88, 93, 96, 97, 102, 103, 106, 109, 113, 121, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 149, 150, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: , and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to P.L. 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150 (a)), \$568,062,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows: After the first comma in said amendment insert: of which \$2,000,000 shall be available for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of P.L. 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150), and; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$568,062,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$31,115,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$101,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$12,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$93,379,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: \$497,943,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$37,655,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$36,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: : Provided further, That the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service may charge reasonable fees for expenses to the Federal Government for providing training by the National Education and Training Center: Provided further, That all training fees collected shall be available to the Director, until expended, without further appropriation, to be used for the costs of training and education provided by the National Education and Training Center; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment amended as follows: Following "Public Law 88-567," insert: *if for any reason the Secretary disapproves for use in 1996 or does not finally approve for use in 1996 any pesticide or chemical which was approved for use in 1995 or had been requested for use in 1996 by the submission of a pesticide use proposal as of September 19, 1995.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$1,083,151,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$37,649,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$36,212,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$143,225,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *\$4,500,000 of the funds provided herein; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$49,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: *Provided, That any funds made available for the purpose of acquisition of the Elwha and Glines dams shall be used solely for acquisition, and shall not be expended until the full purchase amount has been appropriated by the Congress; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: *None of the funds in this Act may be spent by the National Park Service for activities taken in direct response to the United Nations Biodiversity Convention.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: *The National Park Service shall, within existing funds, conduct a Feasibility Study for a northern access route into Denali National Park and Preserve in Alaska, to be completed within one year of the enactment of this Act and submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the House Committee on Resources. The Feasibility Study shall ensure that resource impacts from any plan to create such access route are evaluated with accurate information and according to a process that takes into consideration park values, visitor needs, a full range of alternatives, the viewpoints of all interested parties, including the tourism industry and the State of Alaska, and potential needs for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The Study shall also address the time required for development of alternatives and identify all associated costs.*

This Feasibility Study shall be conducted solely by the National Park Service planning personnel permanently assigned to National Park Service offices located in the State of Alaska in consultation with the State of Alaska Department of Transportation.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: *and to conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries (30 U.S.C. 3, 21a, and 1603; 50 U.S.C. 98g (1) and related purposes as authorized by law and to publish and disseminate data; \$73,503,000; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 42:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows: *and of which \$137,000,000 for resource research and the operations of Cooperative Research Units shall remain available until September 30, 1997, and of which \$16,000,000 shall remain available until expended for conducting inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

Provided further, That funds available herein for resource research may be used for the purchase of not to exceed 61 passenger motor vehicles, of which 55 are for replacement only: Provided further, That none of the funds available under this head for resource research shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property, including new aerial surveys for the designation of habitat under the Endangered Species Act, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the survey or research has been requested and authorized in writing by the property owner or the owner's authorized representative: Provided further, That none of the funds provided herein for resource research

may be used to administer a volunteer program when it is made known the Federal official having authority to obligate or it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the volunteers are not properly trained or that information gathered by the volunteers is not carefully verified: Provided further, That no later than April 1, 1996, the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall issue agency guidelines for resource research that ensure that scientific and technical peer review is utilized as fully as possible in selection of projects for funding and ensure the validity and reliability of research and data collection on Federal lands: Provided further, That no funds available for resource research may be used for any activity that was not authorized prior to the establishment of the National Biological Survey: Provided further, That once every five years the National Academy of Sciences shall review and report on the resource research activities of the Survey: Provided further, That if specific authorizing legislation is enacted during or before the start of fiscal year 1996, the resource research component of the Survey should comply with the provisions of that legislation: Provided further, That unobligated and unexpended balances in the National Biological Survey, Research, inventories and surveys account at the end of fiscal year 1995, shall be merged with and made a part of the United States Geological Survey, Surveys, investigations, and research account and shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1996: Provided further, That the authority granted to the United States Bureau of Mines to conduct mineral surveys and to determine mineral values by section 603 of Public Law 94-579 is hereby transferred to, and vested in, the Director of the United States Geological Survey; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$182,994,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

For expenses necessary for, and incidental to, the closure of the United States Bureau of Mines, \$64,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 may be used for the completion and/or transfer of certain ongoing projects within the United States Bureau of Mines, such projects to be identified by the Secretary of the Interior within 90 days of enactment of this Act: Provided, That there hereby are transferred to, and vested in, the Secretary of Energy: (1) the functions pertaining to the promotion of health and safety in mines and the mineral industry through research vested by law in the Secretary of the Interior or the United States Bureau of Mines and performed in fiscal year 1995 by the United States Bureau of Mines at its Pittsburgh Research Center in Pennsylvania, and at its Spokane Research Center in Washington; (2) the functions pertaining to the conduct of inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use and disposal of mineral substances vested by law in the Secretary of the Interior or the United States Bureau of Mines and performed in fiscal year 1995 by the United States Bureau of Mines under the minerals and materials science programs at its Pittsburgh Research Center in

Pennsylvania, and at its Albany Research Center in Oregon; and (3) the functions pertaining to mineral reclamation industries and the development of methods for the disposal, control, prevention, and reclamation of mineral waste products vested by law in the Secretary of the Interior or the United States Bureau of Mines and performed in fiscal year 1995 by the United States Bureau of Mines at its Pittsburgh Research Center in Pennsylvania: Provided further, That, if any of the same functions were performed in fiscal year 1995 at locations other than those listed above, such functions shall not be transferred to the Secretary of Energy from those other locations: Provided further, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to make such determinations as may be necessary with regard to the transfer of functions which relate to or are used by the Department of the Interior, or component thereof affected by this transfer of functions, and to make such dispositions of personnel, facilities, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds held, used, arising from, available to or to be made available in connection with, the functions transferred herein as are deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of this transfer: Provided further, That all reductions in personnel complements resulting from the provisions of this Act shall, as to the functions transferred to the Secretary of Energy, be done by the Secretary of the Interior as though these transfers had not taken place but had been required of the Department of the Interior by all other provisions of this Act before the transfers of function became effective: Provided further, That the transfers of function to the Secretary of Energy shall become effective on the date specified by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, but in no event later than 90 days after enactment into law of this Act: Provided further, That the reference to "function" includes, but is not limited to, any duty, obligation, power, authority, responsibility, right, privilege, and activity, or the plural thereof, as the case may be; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$173,887,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: \$1,359,434,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: \$100,255,000 shall be for welfare assistance grants and not to exceed \$104,626,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$68,209,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$71,854,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment amended as follows: Before "Provided further" in said amendment, insert: , to become effective on July 1, 1997; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$100,833,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$80,645,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: \$500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert: \$4,500,000.

In lieu of the second sum named in said amendment insert: \$35,914,000.

In lieu of the third sum named in said amendment insert: \$500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: \$65,188,000, of which (1) \$61,661,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance, including maintenance assistance, disaster assistance, insular management controls, and brown tree snake control and research; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment amended as follows:

In lieu of "October 1, 1995" named in said amendment insert: March 1, 1996; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 108. Prior to the transfer of Presidio properties to the Presidio Trust, when authorized, the Secretary may not obligate in any calendar month more than 1/12 of the fiscal year 1996 appropriation for operation of the Presidio: Provided, That this section shall expire on December 31, 1995.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SEC. 118. Section 4(b) of Public Law 94-241 (90 Stat. 263) as added by section 10 of Public Law 99-396 is amended by deleting "until Congress otherwise provides by law." and inserting in lieu thereof: "except that, for fiscal years 1996 through 2002, payments to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands pursuant to the multi-year funding agreements contemplated under the Covenant shall be \$11,000,000 annually, subject to an equal local match and all other requirements set forth in the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future Federal Financial Assistance of the Northern Mariana Islands, executed on December 17, 1992 between the special representative of the President of the United States and special representatives of the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands with any additional amounts otherwise made available under this section in any fiscal year and not required to meet the schedule of payments in this subsection to be provided as set forth in subsection (c) until Congress otherwise provides by law."

"(c) The additional amounts referred to in subsection (b) shall be made available to the Secretary for obligation as follows:

"(1) for fiscal years 1996 through 2001, \$4,580,000 annually for capital infrastructure projects as Impact Aid for Guam under section 104(c)(6) of Public Law 99-239;

"(2) for fiscal year 1996, \$7,700,000 shall be provided for capital infrastructure projects in American Samoa; \$4,420,000 for resettlement of Rongelap Atoll; and

"(3) for fiscal years 1997 and thereafter, all such amounts shall be available solely for capital infrastructure projects in Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands: Provided, That, in fiscal year 1997, \$3,000,000 of such amounts shall be made available to the College of the Northern Marianas and beginning in fiscal year 1997, and in each year thereafter, not to exceed \$3,000,000 may be allocated, as provided in appropriations Acts, to the Secretary of the Interior for use by Federal agencies or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to address immigration, labor, and law enforcement issues in the Northern Mariana Islands. The specific projects to be funded in American Samoa shall be set forth in a five-year plan for infrastructure assistance developed by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the American Samoa Government and updated annually and submitted to the Congress concurrent with the budget justifications for the Department of the Interior. In developing budget recommendations for capital infrastructure funding, the Secretary shall indicate the highest priority projects, consider the extent to which particular projects are part of an overall master plan, whether such project has been reviewed by the Corps of Engineers and any recommendations made as a result of such review, the extent

to which a set-aside for maintenance would enhance the life of the project, the degree to which a local cost-share requirement would be consistent with local economic and fiscal capabilities, and may propose an incremental set-aside, not to exceed \$2,000,000 per year, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, as an emergency fund in the event of natural or other disasters to supplement other assistance in the repair, replacement, or hardening of essential facilities: Provided further, That the cumulative amount set aside for such emergency fund may not exceed \$10,000,000 at any time.

"(d) Within the amounts allocated for infrastructure pursuant to this section, and subject to the specific allocations made in subsection (c), additional contributions may be made, as set forth in appropriations Acts, to assist in the resettlement of Rongelap Atoll: Provided, That the total of all contributions from any Federal source after enactment of this Act may not exceed \$32,000,000 and shall be contingent upon an agreement, satisfactory to the President, that such contributions are a full and final settlement of all obligations of the United States to assist in the resettlement of Rongelap Atoll and that such funds will be expended solely on resettlement activities and will be properly audited and accounted for. In order to provide such contributions in a timely manner, each Federal agency providing assistance or services, or conducting activities, in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, is authorized to make funds available through the Secretary of the Interior, to assist in the resettlement of Rongelap. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the provision of *ex gratia* assistance pursuant to section 105(c)(2) of the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-239, 99 Stat. 1770, 1792) including for individuals choosing not to resettle at Rongelap, except that no such assistance for such individuals may be provided until the Secretary notifies the Congress that the full amount of all funds necessary for resettlement at Rongelap has been provided."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$178,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: \$136,794,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$1,256,253,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$163,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$41,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Retain the matter proposed by said amendment amended as follows: Following "Forest Service," in said amendment insert: *other than the relocation of the Regional Office for Region 5 of the Forest Service from San Francisco to excess military property at Mare Island, Vallejo, California; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 104:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: *Any funds available to the Forest Service may be used for retrofitting Mare Island facilities to accommodate the relocation: Provided, That funds for the move must come from funds otherwise available to Region 5: Provided further, That any funds to be provided for such purposes shall only be available upon approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the duration of fiscal year 1996 none of the funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act may be used in the Tongass National Forest except to implement the Preferred Alternative P in the Tongass Land and Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (dated October 1992) as selected in the Record of Decision Review Draft #3-2/93 (hereinafter referred to as "Alternative P") which shall be deemed sufficient to satisfy all requirements of applicable law: Provided, That the Forest Service may amend the plan during fiscal year 1996 only to the extent necessary to accommodate commercial tourism if an agreement is signed between the Forest Service and the Alaska Visitors' Association: Provided further, That the Secretary shall continue the current Tongass land management planning process, and may replace or modify Alternative P with the selected alternative of a revised Tongass Land Management Plan ("TLMP") which shall, to the maximum extent practicable, contain at least the number of acres of suitable, available timber lands and suitable scheduled timber lands identified in Alternative P: Provided further, That if the Forest Service fails to complete work on a revised TLMP during fiscal year 1996, Alternative P shall remain in effect until such time as a revised plan is completed in accordance with this section and is in effect: Provided further, That hereinafter, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any timber sale or offering that was prepared for acceptance, or was awarded to a purchaser after December 31, 1988, which has been the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and a review under section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act ("ANILCA"), and was subsequently offered or awarded to a different timber purchaser or offeree shall not be subject to additional

analysis under NEPA or ANILCA through any action of the Federal Government or by order of any court of law if the Forest Service determines in a Supplemental Evaluation that no such analysis is necessary: Provided further, That section 502 of P.L. 104-19 shall be deemed permanent law.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: and for promoting health and safety in mines and the mineral industry through research (30 U.S.C. 3, 861(b), and 951(a)), for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), and for the development of methods for the disposal, control, prevention, and reclamation of waste products in the mining, minerals, metal, and mineral reclamation industries (30 U.S.C. 3 and 21a), \$417,169,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$148,786,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$553,293,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$140,696,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$114,196,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$72,266,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$1,722,842,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$238,958,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$308,188,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$6,442,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$5,840,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT

Funds made available under this heading in prior years shall be available for operating and administrative expenses and for the orderly closure of the Corporation, as well as operating and administrative expenses for the functions transferred to the General Services Administration.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of Subsection (g) insert the following:

(g) Section 3(b) of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act of 1972 (40 U.S.C. 872(b)) is amended as follows:

"(b) The Corporation shall be dissolved on or before April 1, 1996. Upon dissolution, assets, obligations, indebtedness, and all unobligated and unexpended balances of the Corporation shall be transferred in accordance with the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 152:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 314. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), no part of any appropriation contained in this Act or any other Act shall be obligated or expended for the operation or implementation of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (hereinafter "Project").

(b)(1) From the funds appropriated to the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management: a sum of \$4,000,000 is made available for the Executive Steering Committee of the Project to publish, and submit to the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Appropriations, and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and Committees on Agriculture, Appropriations, and Resources of the House of Representatives, by April 30, 1996, an assessment on the National Forest System lands and lands ad-

ministered by the Bureau of Land Management (hereinafter "Federal lands") within the area encompassed by the Project. The assessment shall be accompanied by draft Environmental Impact Statements that are not decisional and not subject to judicial review, contain a range of alternatives, without the identification of a preferred alternative or management recommendations, and provide a methodology for conducting any cumulative effects analysis required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) in the preparation of each amendment to a resource management plan pursuant to subsection (c)(2). The Executive Steering Committee shall release the required draft Environmental Impact Statements for a ninety day public comment period. A summary of the public comments received must accompany these documents upon its submission to Congress.

(2) The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall contain the scientific information collected and analysis undertaken by the Project on landscape dynamics and forest and rangeland health conditions and the implications of such dynamics and conditions for forest and rangeland management, specifically the management of forest and rangeland vegetation structure, composition, density and related social and economic effects.

(3) The assessment and draft Environmental Impact Statements required by paragraph (1) shall not: contain any material other than that required in paragraphs (1) and (2); be the subject of consultation or conferencing pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536); or be accompanied by any record of decision or documentation pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act, except as specified in paragraph (1).

(c)(1) From the funds appropriated to the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, each Forest Supervisor of the Forest Service and District Manager of the Bureau of Land Management with responsibility for a national forest or unit of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management (hereinafter "forest") within the area encompassed by the Project shall—

(A) review the resource management plan (hereinafter "plan") for such forest, the scientific information and analysis in the report prepared pursuant to subsection (b) which are applicable to such plan, and any policy which is applicable to such plan upon the date of enactment of this section (whether or not such policy has been added to such plan by amendment), including any which is, or is intended to be, of limited duration, and which the Project addresses; and

(B) based on such review, develop a modification of such policy, or an alternative policy which serves the basic purpose of such policy, to meet the specific conditions of such forest.

(2) For each plan reviewed pursuant to paragraph (1), the Forest Supervisor or District Manager concerned shall prepare and adopt an amendment which: contains the modified or alternative policy developed pursuant to paragraph (1)(B); is directed solely to and affects only such plan; and addresses the specific conditions of the forest to which the plan applies and the relationship of the modified or alternative policy to such conditions. The Forest Supervisor or District Manager concerned shall consult at a minimum, with the Governor of the State, and the Commissioners of the county or counties, and affected tribal governments in which the forest to which the plan applies is situated during the review of the plan required by paragraph (1) and the preparation of an amendment to the plan required by this paragraph.

(3) To the maximum extent practicable, each amendment prepared pursuant to paragraph (2)

shall establish site-specific standards in lieu of imposing general standards applicable to multiple sites. Any amendment which would result in any major change in land use allocations within the plan or would reduce the likelihood of achievement of the goals and objectives of the plan (prior to any previous amendment incorporating in the plan any policy referred to in paragraph (1)(A)) shall be deemed a significant change, pursuant to section 6(f)(4) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(4)) or section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712), requiring a significant plan amendment or equivalent.

(4) Each amendment prepared pursuant to paragraph (2) shall comply with any applicable requirements of section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act, except that any cumulative effects analysis conducted in accordance with the methodology provided pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall be deemed to meet any requirement of such Act for such analysis and the scoping conducted by the Project prior to the date of enactment of this section shall substitute for any scoping otherwise required by such Act for such amendment, unless at the sole discretion of the Forest Supervisor or District Manager additional scoping is deemed necessary.

(5) The review of each plan required by paragraph (1) shall be conducted, and the preparation and decision to approve an amendment to each plan pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be made, by the Forest Supervisor or District Manager, as the case may be, solely on: the basis of the review conducted pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), any consultation or conferencing pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 required by paragraph (6), any documentation required by section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act, and any applicable guidance or other policy issued prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(6)(A) Any policy adopted in an amendment prepared pursuant to paragraph (2) which is a modification of or alternative to a policy referred to in paragraph (1)(A) and upon which consultation or conferencing has occurred pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, shall not again be subject to the consultation or conferencing provisions of such section 7.

(B) If required by such section 7, and not subject to subparagraph (A), the Forest Supervisor or District Manager concerned shall consult or conference separately on each amendment prepared pursuant to paragraph (2).

(C) No Further consultation, other than the consultation specified in subparagraph (B), shall be undertaken on the amendments prepared pursuant to paragraph (2), on any project or activity which is consistent with an applicable amendment, on any policy referred to in paragraph (1)(A), or on any portion of any plan related to such policy or the species to which such policy applies.

(7) Each amendment prepared pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be adopted on or before July 31, 1996: Provided, That any amendment deemed a significant plan amendment, or equivalent, pursuant to paragraph (3) shall be adopted on or before December 31, 1996.

(8) No policy referred to in paragraph (1)(A), or any provision of a plan or other planning document incorporating such policy, shall be effective in any forest subject to the Project on or after December 31, 1996, or after an amendment to the plan which applies to such forest is adopted pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, whichever occurs first.

(9) On the signing of a record of decision or equivalent document making an amendment for the Clearwater National Forest pursuant to paragraph (2), the requirement for revision referred to in the Stipulation of Dismissal dated

September 13, 1993, applicable to the Clearwater National Forest is deemed to be satisfied, and the interim management direction provision contained in the Stipulation of Dismissal shall be of no further effect with respect to the Clearwater National Forest.

(d) The documents prepared under the authority of this section shall not be applied or used to regulate non-Federal lands.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 315. RECREATIONAL FEE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

(a) The Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service) and the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Forest Service) shall each implement a fee program to demonstrate the feasibility of user-generated cost recovery for the operation and maintenance of recreation areas or sites and habitat enhancement projects on Federal lands.

(b) In carrying out the pilot program established pursuant to this section, the appropriate Secretary shall select from areas under the jurisdiction of each of the four agencies referred to in subsection (a) no fewer than 10, but as many as 50, areas, sites or projects for fee demonstration. For each such demonstration, the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) shall charge and collect fees for admission to the area or for the use of outdoor recreation sites, facilities, visitor centers, equipment, and services by individuals and groups, or any combination thereof;

(2) shall establish fees under this section based upon a variety of cost recovery and fair market valuation methods to provide a broad basis for feasibility testing;

(3) may contract, including provisions for reasonable commissions, with any public or private entity to provide visitor services, including reservations and information, and may accept services of volunteers to collect fees charged pursuant to paragraph (1);

(4) may encourage private investment and partnerships to enhance the delivery of quality customer services and resource enhancement, and provide appropriate recognition to such partners or investors; and

(5) may assess a fine of not more than \$100 for any violation of the authority to collect fees for admission to the area or for the use of outdoor recreation sites, facilities, visitor centers, equipment, and services.

(c)(1) Amounts collected at each fee demonstration area, site or project shall be distributed as follows:

(A) Of the amount in excess of 104% of the amount collected in fiscal year 1995, and thereafter annually adjusted upward by 4%, eighty percent to a special account in the Treasury for use without further appropriation, by the agency which administers the site, to remain available for expenditures in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

(B) Of the amount in excess of 104% of the amount collected in fiscal year 1995, and thereafter annually adjusted upward by 4%, twenty percent to a special account in the Treasury for use without further appropriation, by the agency which administers the site, to remain available for expenditure in accordance with paragraph (2)(B).

(C) For agencies other than the Fish and Wildlife Service, up to 15% of current year col-

lections of each agency, but not greater than fee collection costs for that fiscal year, to remain available for expenditure without further appropriation in accordance with paragraph (2)(C).

(D) For agencies other than the Fish and Wildlife Service, the balance to the special account established pursuant to sub-paragraph (A) of section 4(i)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended.

(E) For the Fish and Wildlife Service, the balance shall be distributed in accordance with section 201(c) of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act.

(2)(A) Expenditures from site specific special funds shall be for further activities of the area, site or project from which funds are collected, and shall be accounted for separately.

(B) Expenditures from agency specific special funds shall be for use on an agency-wide basis and shall be accounted for separately.

(C) Expenditures from the fee collection support fund shall be used to cover fee collection costs in accordance with section 4(i)(10)(B) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended: provided, that funds unexpended and unobligated at the end of the fiscal year shall not be deposited into the special account established pursuant to section 4 (i) (1) (A) of said Act and shall remain available for expenditure without further appropriation.

(3) in order to increase the quality of the visitor experience at public recreational areas and enhance the protection of resources, amounts available for expenditure under this section may only be used for the area, site or project concerned, for backlogged repair and maintenance projects (including projects relating to health and safety) and for interpretation, signage, habitat or facility enhancement, resource preservation, annual operation (including fee collection), maintenance, and law enforcement relating to public use. The agencywide accounts may be used for the same purposes set forth in the preceding sentence, but for areas, sites or projects selected at the discretion of the respective agency head.

(d)(1) Amounts collected under this section shall not be taken into account for the purposes of the Act of May 23, 1908 and the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1012), the Act of August 8, 1937 and the Act of May 24, 1939 (43 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.), the Act of June 14, 1926 (43 U.S.C. 869-4), chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 715s), the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601), and any other provision of law relating to revenue allocation.

(2) Fees charged pursuant to this section shall be in lieu of fees charged under any other provision of law.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out this section without promulgating regulations.

(f) The authority to collect fees under this section shall commence on October 1, 1995, and end on September 30, 1998. Funds in accounts established shall remain available through September 30, 2001.

and the Senate Agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 316. Section 2001 (a)(2) of Public Law 104-19 is amended as follows: Strike "September 30, 1997" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1996".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 319. GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK.

Section 3 of the Great Basin National Park Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 410mm-1) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (e) by striking "shall" and inserting "may"; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking "At the request" and inserting the following:

"(1) EXCHANGES.—At the request";

(B) by striking "grazing permits" and inserting "grazing permits and grazing leases"; and

(C) by adding after "Federal lands." the following:

"(2) ACQUISITION BY DONATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire by donation valid existing permits and grazing leases authorizing grazing on land in the park.

(B) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall terminate a grazing permit or grazing lease acquired under subparagraph (A) so as to end grazing previously authorized by the permit or lease."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 322. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws unless (1) legislation to carry out reconciliation instructions pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 is enacted into law and such legislation contains, at a minimum, provisions relating to the patenting of and payment of royalties on such claims, or (2) an agreement is approved by the House and Senate in an identical form on other legislation containing provisions relating to the patenting of, payment of royalties on, and reclamation of such claims.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of the Interior determines that, for the claim concerned: (1) a patent application was filed with the Secretary on or before September 30, 1994, and (2) all requirements established under Sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 29 and 30) for vein or lode claims and Sections 2329, 2330, 2331, and 2333 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 35, 36, and 37) for placer claims, and Section 2337 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 42) for mill site claims, as the case may be, were fully complied with by the applicant by that date.

(c) PROCESSING SCHEDULE.—For those applications for patents pursuant to subsection (b) which were filed with the Secretary of the Interior prior to September 30, 1994, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) Within three months of the enactment of this Act, file with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a plan which details how the Department of the Interior will take final action on at least 90 percent of such applications within three years of the enactment of this Act and file reports annually thereafter with the same committees detailing actions taken by the Department of the Interior to carry out such plan; and

(2) Take such actions as may be necessary to carry out such plan.

(d) MINERAL EXAMINATIONS.—In order to process patent applications more expeditiously, the Secretary of the Interior shall require an applicant that has submitted an application subject to subsection (b) to fund the retention by the Bureau of Land Management of a qualified third-party contractor to conduct a mineral examination of the mining claims or mill sites contained in the patent application. The Bureau of Land Management shall have the sole responsibility to choose and pay the third-party contractor.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: 328; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 165:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: 329; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 330; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SEC. 331. (a) PURPOSES OF NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS.—Section 2 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 951), sets out findings and purposes for which the National Endowment for the Arts was established, among which are—

(1) "The arts and humanities belong to all the people of the United States";

(2) "The arts and humanities reflect the high place accorded by the American people . . . to the fostering of mutual respect for the diverse beliefs and values of all persons and groups";

(3) "Public funding of the arts and humanities is subject to the conditions that traditionally govern the use of public money [and] such funding should contribute to public support and confidence in the use of taxpayer funds"; and

(4) "Public funds provided by the Federal Government must ultimately serve public purposes the Congress defines".

(b) ADDITIONAL CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—Congress further finds and declares that the use of scarce funds, which have been taken from all taxpayers of the United States, to promote, disseminate, sponsor, or produce any material or performance that—

(1) denigrates the religious objects or religious beliefs of the adherents of a particular religion, or

(2) depicts or describes, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs

is contrary to the express purposes of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended.

(c) PROHIBITION ON FUNDING THAT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF THE ACT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the scarce funds which have been taken from all taxpayers of the United States and

made available under this Act to the National Endowment for the Arts may be used to promote, disseminate, sponsor, or produce any material or performance that—

(1) denigrates the religious objects or religious beliefs of the adherents of a particular religion, or

(2) depicts or describes, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs,

and this prohibition shall be strictly applied without regard to the content or viewpoint of the material or performance.

(d) SECTION NOT TO AFFECT OTHER WORKS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect in any way the freedom of any artist or performer to create any material or performance using funds which have not been made available under this Act to the National Endowment for the Arts.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SEC. 332. For purposes related to the closure of the Bureau of Mines, funds made available to the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Mines, and the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, among the following accounts: United States Geological Survey, Surveys, investigations, and research; Bureau of Mines, Mines and minerals; and Bureau of Land Management, Management of lands and resources. The Secretary of Energy shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior, in an amount to be determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, for the expenses of the transferred functions between October 1, 1995 and the effective date of the transfers of function. Such transfers shall be subject to the reprogramming guidelines of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

And the Senate agree to the same.

RALPH REGULA,

JOSEPH M. MCDADE,

JIM KOLBE,

JOE SKEEN,

BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,

CHARLES H. TAYLOR,

GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT,

JR.,

JIM BUNN,

BOB LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SLADE GORTON,

TED STEVENS,

THAD COCHRAN,

MARK O. HATFIELD,

CONRAD BURNS,

ROBERT F. BENNETT,

CONNIE MACK,

ROBERT C. BYRD,

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,

PATRICK J. LEAHY, (Except

amendments 136, 138, 168,

and 169)

FRITZ HOLLINGS,

HARRY REID,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1977), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for

other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conference agreement on H.R. 1977 incorporates some of the provisions of both the House and the Senate versions of the bill. Report language and allocations set forth in either House Report 104-173 or Senate Report 104-125 which are not changed by the conference are approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not negate the language referenced above unless expressly provided herein.

The managers have included funding in each of the land acquisition accounts that is not earmarked by individual projects. The managers direct the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service to develop a proposed distribution of project funding for review and approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. In developing the proposed distributions, the agencies are encouraged to give consideration to a broader array of projects than was proposed in the fiscal year 1996 budget, including but not limited to, projects for which capability statements have been prepared.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$568,062,000 for management of lands and resources instead of \$570,017,000 as proposed by the House and \$563,936,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amendment also adds language to transfer responsibility for mineral assessments in Alaska from the Bureau of Mines.

The net decrease below the House consists of decreases of \$1,500,000 for wild horse and burro management, \$500,000 for threatened and endangered species, \$1,000,000 for recreation wilderness management, \$448,000 for recreation resources management, \$50,000 for coal management, \$50,000 for other mineral resources, \$554,000 for land and realty management, \$4,000,000 for ALMRS, \$500,000 for administrative support, and \$834,000 for bureau-wide fixed costs; and increases of \$4,981,000 for Alaska conveyance, \$500,000 for information systems operations and \$2,000,000 for mineral assessments in Alaska formerly funded under the Bureau of Mines.

Amendment No. 2: Restores House provision stricken by the Senate which provides \$599,999 for the management of the East Mojave National Scenic Area. The Senate had no similar provision. The amendment also adds language earmarking \$2,000,000 for mineral assessments in Alaska.

Amendment No. 3: Restates the final appropriation amount for management of lands and resources as \$568,062,000 instead of \$570,017,000 as proposed by the House and \$563,936,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$235,924,000 for wildland fire management as proposed by the House instead of \$240,159,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION AND ACCESS

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$3,115,000 for construction and access instead of \$2,515,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,615,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:

Sourdough Campground,	
AK	\$584,000

Byington Campground, ID	290,000
West Aravaipa Ranger Station, AZ	200,000
Railroad Flat Campground, CA	218,000
Penitente Canyon, CO	220,000
James Kipp Campground, MT	345,000
Datil Well Rec Site reconstruction, NM	41,000
Encampment River Rec Area, WY	60,000
Indian Creek Accessibility Rehab, NV	57,000
El Camino Real Int'l Heritage Ctr., NM-A&E	500,000
Flagstaff Hill, OR	600,000
Total	3,115,000

The managers urge BLM and the non-Federal partners to consider during the A&E phase of the El Camino Real International Heritage Center project the fact that future construction funds are likely to be severely constrained.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$101,500,000 for payments in lieu of taxes instead of \$111,409,000 as proposed by the House and \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

LAND ACQUISITION

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$12,800,000 for land acquisition instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. The \$12,800,000 includes \$3,250,000 for acquisition management, \$1,000,000 for emergency and inholding purchases, and \$8,550,000 for land purchases.

Funds provided under this account for land purchases are subject to the guidelines identified at the front of this statement.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$93,379,000 for Oregon and California grant lands instead of \$91,387,000 as proposed by the House and \$95,364,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The net increase above the House consists of a reduction of \$900,000 for resources management, and increases of \$1,115,000 for facilities maintenance, and \$1,777,000 for Jobs-in-the-Woods.

The managers are concerned about the many programs in the President's Forest Plan designed to provide assistance to timber dependent communities in the Pacific Northwest. The managers are disturbed by the inability of the agencies involved to provide a detailed accounting of funds appropriated in previous fiscal years in the President's Forest Plan for the unemployed timber worker programs.

The managers expect the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare a detailed accounting and report of the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1995 for the President's Forest plan. The report shall include a careful accounting of appropriated funding, including: funds appropriated for timber production; administrative expenses, including the number of Federal employees employed to administer the various aspects of the President's plan; funds appropriated for the various jobs programs under the President's plan, including but not limited to the Jobs in the Woods program; the number of individuals employed by these programs; and the average length of employment in the various jobs. The managers expect the Secretaries to submit the report to the Committees no later than March 31, 1996.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$497,943,000 for resource management instead of

\$497,150,000 as proposed by the House and \$501,478,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The net increase above the House consists of increases of \$3,800,000 for cooperative conservation agreements, \$750,000 for listing, \$2,237,000 for habitat conservation, \$1,502,000 for migratory bird management, \$600,000 for hatchery operations and maintenance, \$800,000 for fish and wildlife management, \$478,000 for the National Education and Training Center, and \$885,000 for vehicle and aircraft purchase; and reductions of \$500,000 for recovery, \$230,000 for environmental contaminants, \$6,542,000 for refuge operations and maintenance, and \$2,987,000 for service-wide administrative support.

The conference agreement includes \$3,800,000 for cooperative conservation agreements with private landowners to institute effective management measures that make listing unnecessary. The managers intend that these funds also be used to implement the 4(d) rule which is intended to ease endangered species land use restrictions on small landowners. The managers agree that none of the funding for cooperative conservation agreements or listing be used in any way to conduct activities which would directly support listing of species or designating critical habitat.

The managers have included \$750,000 under the listing program to be used only for delisting and downlisting of threatened and endangered species in order to ease land use restrictions on private and public lands.

The conference agreement includes a reduction of \$200,000 from the gray wolf re-introduction program. The managers expect the Service to continue the cooperative agreement with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to provide assistance to ranchers experiencing livestock losses to wolves.

The managers agree with the Senate position regarding the continued operation of Federal fish hatcheries. However, the funding provided for hatcheries in total is below last year's level, so reductions will be necessary. The managers encourage those non-Federal parties that have expressed an interest in participating in hatchery transfers to continue to pursue this option, and the Service should provide the transitional assistance for such efforts as was contemplated in the budget. Within the funds restored for hatchery operations and maintenance, \$500,000 is provided only for maintenance of those hatcheries transferred during fiscal year 1996.

The managers reiterate, however, the need for the working group proposed by the Senate to identify, by March 1, 1996, savings from the fisheries program that equal or surpass the savings associated with the hatchery transfers or closures proposed in the budget. Outyear funding for fisheries and other programs cannot be assured at a time of declining budgets, and future transfer proposals might not involve transitional assistance. The managers expect that there will be significantly fewer Federal fish hatcheries by the end of fiscal year 1997.

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation is funded at a level of \$4,000,000. The House recommended that no funds be provided for this purpose in the future. The Senate took no position regarding outyear funding for the Foundation.

The managers direct the Department to reinstate its 1992 policy, modified to reflect public comments received, regarding permit terms and conditions for hunting and fishing guides in Alaska providing permit terms of 5 years with one renewal period of 5 years,

transferability under prescribed conditions, and a right of survivorship. At such time as the new policy is implemented, existing permits should be reissued consistent with this policy. The managers note that the existing policy limiting terms to one year makes it impossible to obtain financing for guiding operations while the limit on transferability and survivorship prevent long-time family businesses from continuing upon the death or illness of the permit holder.

The managers recognize the Fish and Wildlife Service's fisheries mitigation responsibilities pursuant to existing law and expect the working group to take into account such responsibilities.

Amendment No. 10: Extends availability of \$11,557,000 for Lower Snake River compensation plan facilities until expended as proposed by the Senate, instead of limiting the availability to September 30, 1997 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: includes language proposed by the Senate which prohibits listing additional species as threatened or endangered and prohibits designating critical habitat during fiscal year 1996 or until a reauthorization is enacted. The House had no similar provision.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$37,655,000 for construction instead of \$26,355,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:

Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, UT, flood repair	\$1,000,000
Bosque del Apache NWR, NM, repair	1,820,000
Hawaii captive propagation facility, HI	1,000,000
Mississippi refuges, bridge repair and equipment	1,120,000
National Education Training Center, WV, construction	24,000,000
Quivira NWR, KS, water management	760,000
Russian River, AK, rehab	400,000
Southeast Louisiana refuges, rehab	1,000,000
Wichita Mountains NWR, OK, Grama Lake and Comanche Dams, repair	700,000
Dam safety, service-wide inspections	460,000
Bridge safety, service-wide inspections	395,000
Emergency projects—service-wide	1,000,000
Construction management—service-wide	4,000,000
Total	37,655,000

The managers expect the Department to include the remaining funding necessary to complete the construction of the National Education and Training Center in the fiscal year 1997 budget.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$4,000,000 for the natural resource damage assessment fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,019,000 as proposed by the House.

The reductions below the House consist of \$1,597,000 for damage assessments and \$422,000 for program management.

LAND ACQUISITION

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$36,900,000 for land acquisition instead of \$14,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,031,000 as proposed by the Senate. The \$36,900,000 includes

\$8,000,000 for acquisition management, \$1,000,000 for emergency and hardship purchases, \$1,000,000 for inholding purchases, \$1,000,000 for land exchanges, and \$25,900,000 for refuge land purchases.

Funds provided under this account for land purchases are subject to the guidelines identified at the front of this statement.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$6,750,000 for the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

The increase above the House includes \$2,230,000 for habitat management and \$20,000 for administration.

The House recommended that no funds be provided for this purpose in the future. The Senate took no position regarding outyear funding for this program.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION FUND

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$800,000 for the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$998,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Deletes matching requirements proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate. The matching requirements of the Partnerships for Wildlife Act will continue to apply, and do not need to be stated in the appropriations act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 18: Provides authority to purchase 113 motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 54 passenger vehicles as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Deletes House prohibition on purchasing police vehicles. The Senate had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 20: Includes Senate provision that the Fish and Wildlife Service may accept donated aircraft. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 21: Includes House provision prohibiting the Fish and Wildlife Service from delaying the issuance of a wetlands permit for the City of Lake Jackson, TX. The Senate had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 22: Modifies Senate provision on the distribution of refuge entrance fees by substituting language which allows the Fish and Wildlife Service to charge reasonable fees for expenses associated with the conduct of training programs at the National Education and Training Center. Any fees collected for this purpose will be used to cover costs associated with the operation of this facility. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 23: Modifies Senate provision regarding use of pesticides on farmland within wildlife refuges in the Klamath Basin. The amendment is based, in part, upon the Service's representation that it has already approved or anticipates approval of certain materials that are needed for farming during this fiscal year and that it will consider other materials for 1996 and subsequent years. If these approvals do not occur or are withdrawn, the Senate language will prevail and growers will be subject to the same restrictions as growers on private lands. Allowing the pesticide use proposal process to remain in effect for the next fiscal year will enable growers and the Federal government to work constructively toward an agreeable process.

NATURAL RESOURCES SCIENCE AGENCY RESEARCH, INVENTORIES AND SURVEYS

Amendment No. 24: Deletes Senate language providing \$145,965,000 for a natural re-

sources science agency and providing guidance on the operation of that agency. This agency would have replaced the National Biological Service. The House had no similar provision. The managers have agreed to eliminate the National Biological Service and to fund natural resources research as part of the U.S. Geological Survey as proposed by the House. This item is discussed in more detail under amendment Nos. 42 and 43.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$1,083,151,000 for operation of the National park system instead of \$1,088,249,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,092,265,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction from the Senate level reflects the transfer of the equipment replacement account back to the construction account.

In keeping with the demands placed on other Interior bureaus, the managers have not funded uncontrollable costs and expect these costs to be absorbed through reductions to levels of review and management. Efficiencies should also be sought by exploring opportunities that exist and have been outlined in GAO reports to co-locate and combine functions, systems, programs, activities or field locations with other Federal land management agencies.

The managers are concerned about the costs associated with the current reorganization effort and strongly urge the NPS to limit expenditures for task forces, work groups and employee details and special assistants. The managers request that a report be submitted by February 1, 1996, detailing a budget history of past costs and future estimated costs associated with the reorganization.

The managers expect a report within 45 days of enactment of this Act identifying NPS' preliminary allocations for fiscal year 1996. This report will serve as the baseline for any reprogrammings in fiscal year 1996.

In considering these allocations, the managers expect that none of the programmatic increases requested in the budget are to be considered except those necessary to meet specific park operating needs. This includes new and expanded programs. Any new initiative such as those related to training, reorganization or national service should be addressed through the reprogramming process.

The managers expect that the National Park Service will use these operating funds for core park programs.

The managers expect that the principle goal of the reorganization plan, which is to relocate staff from central and regional offices to the parks, will greatly alleviate the pressures placed on parks by increased visitation.

The managers have agreed to the House position regarding the termination of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and the transfer of certain specific activities to other agencies including the National Park Service. This item is discussed in greater detail in amendment Number 151 in Title III.

Amendment No. 26: Restores House language stricken by the Senate regarding the availability of funds at the Mojave National Preserve.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$37,649,000 for National recreation and preservation instead of \$35,725,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,094,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The reduction of \$445,000 in Statutory and Contractual Aid from the Senate amount re-

flects the elimination of \$23,000 for the Maine Acadian Cultural Preservation Commission and a reduction of \$422,000 for the Native Hawaiian Culture and Arts program.

Amendment No. 28: Earmarks \$236,000 for the William O. Douglas Outdoor Education Center as proposed by the Senate instead of \$248,000 as proposed by the House.

As discussed under amendment No. 155, no funds are provided for the Mississippi River Corridor Heritage Commission. Within funds provided, the National Park Service shall publish the final report and enter into no other activities related to this corridor. The funds included in the Senate bill for the Commission have been transferred to the rivers and trails program.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$36,212,000 for the Historic Preservation Fund instead of \$37,934,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,312,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers have provided \$32,712,000 for State grants and \$3,500,000 for the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The managers agree to a three year period of transition for the National Trust for Historic Preservation to replace Federal funds with private funding.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$143,225,000 for construction instead of \$114,868,000 as proposed by the House and \$116,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree to the following distribution of funds:

Andersonville National Historic Site, GA (prisoner of war museum)	\$2,800,000
Assateague National Seashore, MD (erosion control)	300,000
Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor MARI (interpretive project)	300,000
Blue Ridge Parkway, Hemphill Knob, NC (administration building)	1,030,000
Cane River Creole National Historic Park, LA (preservation and stabilization)	4,000,000
Chickasaw National Recreation Area, OK (campground rehabilitation)	1,624,000
Chamizal National Monument, TX (rehabilitation)	300,000
Crater Lake National Park, OR (dormitories construction)	10,000,000
Cuyahoga National Recreation Area, OH (site and structure rehabilitation)	2,500,000
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, PA (trails rehabilitation)	1,050,000
Everglades National Park, FL (water delivery system modification)	4,500,000
Fort Necessity National Battlefield, PA (rehabilitation)	265,000
Fort Smith National Historic Site, AR (rehabilitation)	500,000
Gateway National Recreation Area, NY (Jacob Riis Park rehabilitation)	1,595,000
General Grant National Memorial, NY (rehabilitation)	1,000,000
Gettysburg National Military Park, PA (water and sewer lines)	2,550,000

Glacier National Park, MT (rehabilitate chalets)	328,000	Zion National Park, UT (transportation system facilities)	5,200,000
Grand Canyon National Park, AZ: Transportation	1,000,000	Subtotal, line item construction	90,162,000
Gulf Islands National Seashore, MS (erosion control)	600,000	Emergency, unscheduled, housing	13,973,000
Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, WV (utilities and phone lines)	455,000	Planning	17,000,000
Hot Springs NP, AR (stabilization/Lead Point)	500,000	Equipment replacement	14,365,000
James A. Garfield National Historic Site, OH (rehabilitation/development) ..	3,600,000	General management plans	6,600,000
Jean Lafitte National Park and Preserve, LA (complete repairs)	2,100,000	Special resource studies	825,000
Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, AK (restore Skagway historic district)	850,000	Strategic planning office	300,000
Lackawanna Valley, PA (technical assistance)	400,000	Total	\$143,225,000
Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, WA (planning and design for repair of Company Creek Road)	280,000	The bill provides \$1,000,000 for transportation related activities at Grand Canyon National Park. These funds are to be made available for transportation projects that the Superintendent of the Grand Canyon Park has identified as high priority. Therefore, it is the intent of the managers that these moneys be used for any transportation related expenditure, including the design of new transportation facilities and the purchase of new buses.	
Little River Canyon National Park, AL (health and safety)	460,000		
Mount Rainier National Park, WA (replace employee dormitory)	6,050,000	The managers encourage the National Park Service to proceed expeditiously with the necessary work at Cane River Creole NHP, LA.	
Natchez Trace Parkway, MS	3,000,000		
National Capital Parks—Central, DC (Lincoln/Jefferson memorials rehabilitation)	4,000,000	The region which comprises the 1.4 million acre East Mojave Desert is embraced by a unique blend of human uses (past and present) and nationally significant natural features. The managers are concerned that National Park Service management of the area has not adequately ensured the continuation of human uses which give the region its character, in balance with protection for the area's scenic and environmental qualities. The managers do not want their action to be construed as repealing portions of the California Desert Protection Act (P.L. 103-433).	
New River Gorge National River, WV (trails, visitor access and hazardous materials)	625,000		
President's Park, DC: Replace White House electrical system	1,000,000	The managers believe that it is essential to not only protect the area's unique resources but also preserve its multiple use values, both natural and human, in cooperation with Federal agencies, State agencies and local governments. Recent jurisdictional conflicts involving State wildlife agencies and the National Park Service have jeopardized vital wildlife recovery efforts in this region.	
Sagamore Hill National Historic Site, NY (water and sewer lines)	800,000		
Salem Maritime National Historic Site, MA (vessel exhibit)	2,200,000	The National Park Service is directed to develop a comprehensive, long-term management plan for the area which incorporates traditional uses and recognizes budgetary constraints. The National Park Service may use up to \$100,000 within available funds for these planning activities. The National Park Service is directed to present its management plan to both the House and Senate appropriations and authorizing Committees for final approval prior to any reprogramming of funds so that the Mojave provision will not have to be continued in Fiscal Year 1997.	
Saratoga National Historical Park, NY (monument rehabilitation)	2,000,000		
Sequoia National Park, CA (replace Giant Sequoia facilities)	3,700,000	Amendment No. 31: Earmarks \$4,500,000 for the Everglades as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House.	
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (various projects)	2,000,000		
Stones River National Battlefield, TN (stabilization)	200,000	Amendment No. 32: Retains the Senate provision indicating Historic Preservation funds may be available until expended to stabilize buildings associated with the Kennicott, Alaska copper mine. The House had no similar provision.	
Thomas Stone Historic Site, MD (rehabilitation)	250,000		
Western Trails Center, IA	3,000,000	LAND ACQUISITION	
Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, AK (Kennicott Mine site safety and rehabilitation)	1,500,000		
Yosemite National Park, CA (El Portal maintenance facilities)	9,650,000	Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$49,100,000 for land acquisition instead of \$14,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$45,187,000 as proposed by the Senate. The \$49,100,000 includes \$7,200,000 for acquisition management, \$3,000,000 for emergency and hardship purchases, \$3,000,000 for inholding purchases,	

\$1,500,000 for State grant administration, and \$34,400,000 for other land purchases.

Amendment No. 34: Deletes the earmark inserted by the House and stricken by the Senate for Federal assistance to the State of Florida. Authority exists for the Department to use land acquisition funds for a grant to the State of Florida if approved pursuant to the procedures identified for land acquisition in fiscal year 1996.

Amendment No. 35: Modifies language proposed by the Senate which requires that funds which may be made available for the acquisition of the Elwha and Glines dams shall be used solely for acquisition, and shall not be expended until the full purchase amount has been appropriated by the Congress. The House had no similar provision. Consistent with the direction for the land acquisition accounts, no specific earmark is provided for this project. Under the procedures identified for land acquisition, however, funds could be made available for the Elwha and Glines dams.

The Elwha Act, P.L. 102-495, authorizes the purchase of the Elwha and Glines dams by the Secretary of the Interior at a total purchase price of \$29,500,000. Recognizing the serious funding constraints under which the Committees are operating, bill language has been included which authorizes funding to be provided over a period of years, as necessary, in order to acquire the dams. The bill language specifies that the appropriated funds may only be used for acquisition. Appropriated funds cannot be expended until the total purchase price of \$29,500,000 is appropriated.

Under the Elwha Act, the Secretary is authorized to study the benefits of the removal of both dams, and to assess the costs of such a removal to restore fish runs in the Elwha River. The managers continue to be disturbed greatly by the early projections from the Administration of costs that range from \$80-\$300 million for dam removal. Due to the lack of available funds, the managers strongly discourage the Administration and those parties supporting dam removal from continuing to support such a policy. Instead, the managers encourage interested parties to pursue other, less costly alternatives to achieve fish restoration. The managers urge parties interested in the Elwha Act to work to find, within the next year, a more fiscally responsible and achievable solution to fishery restoration in lieu of dam removal. If no conclusion can be reached on this issue, the appropriations committees, working with the authorizing committees, will be forced to work to find a legislative solution to the problem.

The managers have included \$1,500,000 for administration of the state grant program. These funds are provided only to close down ongoing projects. No funds are provided for new grants and the managers intend that no funds will be provided in the future.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 36: Retains Senate language regarding an agreement for the redevelopment of the southern end of Ellis Island and providing for Congressional review. Identical language has been included in previous interior appropriations bills.

Amendment No. 37: Modifies language proposed by the Senate to clarify that funds may not be used by the National Park Service for activities taken in direct response to the United Nations Biodiversity Convention. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 38: Retains language proposed by the Senate allowing the American Battlefield Protection Program to enter into

cooperative agreements of various types with other entities. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 39: Modifies Senate language regarding a feasibility study for a northern access route into Denali National Park and Preserve in Alaska. The modification is to require that the study also be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Amendment No. 40: Deletes Senate language regarding the Stampede Creek Mine at Denali National Park in Alaska. The House had no similar provision.

If requested by the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, the National Park Service shall enter into negotiations regarding a memorandum of understanding for continued use of the Stampede Creek mine property. The Park Service should report to the relevant Congressional committees by May 1, 1996 on an assessment of damages resulting from the April 30, 1987 explosion. The repair or replacement should be to the same condition as existed on April 30, 1987. If the University of Alaska at Fairbanks seeks to replace the facilities, the Park Service should consider working with the Army to assist in any compensation to which the University of Alaska at Fairbanks may be eligible since the Army assisted the National Park Service with the explosives work conducted at Stampede Creek on April 30, 1987.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$730,503,000 for surveys, investigations and research instead of \$686,944,000 as proposed by the House and \$577,503,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amendment also provides authority for minerals information activities formerly conducted in the Bureau of Mines.

Changes to the amount proposed by the House include increases of \$24,112,000 for natural resources research, \$16,000,000 for minerals information activities transferred from the Bureau of Mines and \$4,000,000 for university earthquake research grants, and decreases in Federal water resources investigations of \$176,000 for data collection and analysis and \$100,000 for hydrology of critical aquifers and a decrease of \$277,000 in the National mapping program for cartographic and geographic research.

The managers have provided \$4,000,000 for university research in the earthquakes program. If there is a compelling need for additional funds in this program in fiscal year 1996 and an acceptable funding offset can be justified, the USGS should notify the Committees following the existing reprogramming guidelines. The Committees will consider any such request on its merits.

The managers understand that the USGS is constrained from releasing certain information under interagency agreement No. AGP00473.94 with the Bureau of Indian Affairs absent the approval of the BIA. This issue is discussed in more detail in the BIA section of this statement.

The managers have agreed to fund a competitive program for the water resources research institutes with at least a 2 to 1 funding match from non-Federal sources. The managers expect that this approach likely will lead to the closure of some of the institutes. The managers recommend that in fiscal year 1996 a modest base grant of \$20,000 per participating institute be provided with the balance of the funding for the program to be competitively awarded based on National program priorities established by the USGS. The need for continuing a small base grant beyond fiscal year 1996 should be carefully

examined by the USGS in the context of its fiscal year 1997 budget priorities. The managers do not object to competitions being regionally-based if that approach is determined by the USGS to be the most productive, from the standpoint of meeting the most compelling information needs, and the most cost effective. If a regional approach is selected, the managers suggest that the USGS regions be consolidated so that there are no more than 4 or 5 large regional areas. The competition should not be structured to ensure that every participating institute in a region gets a competitive award. The USGS should report to the Committees in the fiscal year 1997 budget submission on how the competition is to be structured and should report in subsequent budget submissions on the distribution of competitively awarded grants by institute.

Amendment No. 42: Earmarks \$137,000,000 for natural resources research and cooperative research units instead of \$112,888,000 as proposed by the House. The Senate recommended funding this research under a separate account and at a level of \$145,965,000 as discussed in amendment No. 24. The amendment also earmarks \$16,000,000 for minerals information activities transferred from the Bureau of Mines, mines and minerals account (see amendment No. 47).

The managers agree that natural resources research in the Department of the Interior should be organized in a manner that ensures that it is independent from regulatory control and scientifically excellent. The managers intend the merger of these research activities into the USGS to be permanent. The USGS is directed to plan and manage the restructuring and downsizing of the former National Biological Service. Retrenchments required to remain within the reduced level of appropriations for the former NBS are to occur predominantly in administrative, managerial and other headquarters support functions of that organization so as to maintain, to the maximum extent possible, scientific and technical capabilities.

The managers expect the agency to work closely with the land management agencies to identify priority science needs of concern to the Department's land managers on the ground. The managers are concerned that natural resource research be linked closely to management issues. In addition, attention should be provided to information related to wildlife resources entrusted to the stewardship of the Department; fisheries, including restoration of depleted stocks; fish propagation and riverine studies; aquatic resources; nonindigenous nuisances that affect aquatic ecosystems; impacts and epidemiology of disease on fish and wildlife populations; chemical drug registration for aquatic species; and effective transfer of information to natural resources managers.

During fiscal year 1996, funds appropriated for the functions of the former NBS shall remain a separate entity, titled "natural resources research", within the USGS. Upon completion of the necessary downsizing, and no later than nine months after enactment of this legislation, the managers direct the USGS to provide the Committees with a final plan for the permanent consolidation and integration of natural resources research functions into the USGS. As of October 1, 1996, employees of the former NBS shall be subject to the same administrative guidelines and practices followed by the USGS including peer review of research and investigations, maintenance of objectivity and impartiality, and ethics requirements regarding financial disclosure and divestiture.

The managers expect that the USGS budget request for fiscal year 1997 will require amendment subsequent to its submission to reflect appropriately this consolidation. To reiterate, this merger is intended to be permanent and should be implemented fully by October 1, 1996.

During fiscal year 1996 the Department and the USGS are prohibited from reprogramming funds from other USGS programs and activities for any program or activity within the Department for natural resources research activities.

The managers also have agreed to provide \$16,000,000 for minerals information activities, transferred from the Bureau of Mines. The funding represents a reduction from the fiscal year 1995 level and may require significant downsizing and restructuring of the program. The USGS should oversee the refocusing of the program. Until such downsizing is completed, the program should remain a separate and distinct budget and organizational entity within the USGS. To the extent job vacancies occur in the transferred program in fiscal year 1996, they should be filled with Bureau of Mines employees subject to termination or reduction-in-force. The managers understand that the existing USGS mineral resources survey activity is undergoing a restructuring and downsizing and expect that effort and the required downsizing of the minerals information program to proceed independently. When both downsizing efforts are completed, a single, refocused minerals program should be created which combines the minerals information activities transferred from the Bureau of Mines with other USGS mineral resources work.

Amendment No. 43: Modifies language inserted by the House and stricken by the Senate providing guidance on the conduct of natural resources research. The change to the House position expands the prohibition on the use of funds for new surveys on private property to include new aerial surveys for the designation of habitat under the Endangered Species Act unless authorized in writing by the property owner. With respect to natural resources research activities, the managers agree that funds may not be used for new surveys on private property without the written consent of the land owner, that volunteers are to be properly trained and that volunteer-collected data are to be verified carefully. The amendment also transfers authority from the Bureau of Mines to the Director of the USGS to conduct mineral surveys, consistent with the funding for that purpose earmarked under amendment No. 42.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$182,994,000 for royalty and offshore minerals management instead of \$186,556,000 as proposed by the House and \$182,169,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the amount proposed by the House include decreases in information management of \$151,000 for the absorption of fixed cost increases and \$3,000,000 which is offset by the authority to use additional receipts as provided in amendment Nos. 45 and 46; and decreases in general administration of \$306,000 for administrative operations and \$105,000 for general support services.

The managers agree that the independent review of the royalty management program which was recommended by the House should not be conducted until the disposition of the hardrock minerals program is legislatively resolved. Accordingly, no funds are earmarked for this effort in fiscal year 1996.

Amendment No. 45: Provides for the use of \$15,400,000 in increased receipts for the technical information management system as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46: Permits the use of additional receipts for Outer Continental Shelf program activities in addition to the technical information management system as proposed by the Senate. The House had no similar provision.

BUREAU OF MINES MINES AND MINERALS

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$64,000,000 for mines and minerals instead of \$87,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$128,007,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for the transfer of health and safety research to the Department of Energy (see amendment No. 110). The \$64,000,000 provided for mines and minerals is to be used for the orderly closure of the Bureau of Mines.

The managers expect that the health and safety functions in Pittsburgh, PA and Spokane, WA will be continued under the Department of Energy as will the materials partnerships programs in Albany, OR. The U.S. Geological Survey will assume responsibility for the minerals information program in Denver, CO and Washington, DC. The Bureau of Land Management will assume responsibility for mineral assessments in Alaska. The managers do not object to a limited number of administrative support personnel being maintained in these locations. All other functions of the Bureau of Mines will be terminated and all other Bureau locations will be closed. The funds provided under this head should be sufficient to provide termination costs and to provide for environmental cleanup costs and for the required oversight and closeout of contracts. The managers understand that some contracts will require oversight through a logical completion point to ensure that the Federal investment is not lost. One example is the construction associated with the Casa Grande in situ copper leaching program. The managers expect that there will be few such cases and expect the Secretary to notify the Committees of the rationale for continuing specific contracts, not transferred to DOE, BLM or USGS, beyond the closure of the Bureau. The managers expect the Secretary to proceed apace with the termination of the Bureau using the funds provided herein.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$95,970,000 for regulation and technology as proposed by the Senate instead of \$93,251,000 as proposed by the House.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$173,887,000 for the abandoned mine reclamation fund instead of \$176,327,000 as proposed by the House and \$170,441,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The net decrease below the House consists of reductions of \$500,000 for donations, \$2,000,000 for reclamation program operations, and \$93,000 for administrative support; and increases of \$13,000 for executive direction and \$140,000 for general services.

Amendment No. 50: Deletes House earmark of \$5,000,000 for the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative. The Senate had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 51: Deletes House provision that allowed the use of donations for the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative. The Senate had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 52: Includes Senate provision which allows States to use part of their reclamation grants as a funding match to treat and abate acid mine drainage, consistent with the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA). The House had no similar provision.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$1,359,434,000 for the Operation of Indian Programs instead of \$1,509,628,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,261,234,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the amount proposed by the House from Tribal Priority Allocations include decreases of \$1,500,000 for contract support, \$4,000,000 for small and needy tribes, and a general reduction of \$117,136,000.

Changes from Other Recurring Programs include: increases of \$1,109,000 for ISEP formula funds, \$1,000,000 for student transportation, and \$73,000 for Lake Roosevelt; and decreases of \$1,109,000 for ISEP adjustments, \$1,000,000 for early childhood development, and \$1,186,000 for community development—facilities O&M; and a transfer of \$3,047,000 from trust services to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.

Changes from Nonrecurring Programs include: increases of \$400,000 for Self-Determination grants, \$1,500,000 for community economic development grants, \$250,000 for technical assistance, and \$1,500,000 for water rights negotiations; and decreases of \$442,000 for attorney fees and \$125,000 for resources management for absorption of pay costs.

Changes from Central Office Operations include: a decrease of \$126,000 for the substance abuse coordination office, a decrease of \$2,000,000 for education program management, a \$12,477,000 transfer from trust services to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians, a transfer of \$447,000 from general administration to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians, and a general reduction of \$14,400,000.

Changes from Area Office Operations include a transfer of \$2,367,000 from trust services to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and a general reduction of \$14,447,000.

Changes from Special Programs and Pooled Overhead include: increases of \$1,337,000 for special higher education scholarships, \$962,000 for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, \$1,780,000 for intra-governmental billings, and \$57,000 for direct rentals; and decreases of \$866,000 for the Indian Child Welfare Act, \$1,500,000 for employee displacement costs, \$141,000 for personnel consolidation, \$664,000 for GSA rentals, \$1,666,000 for human resources development, and a \$23,000 general reduction.

Amendment No. 54: Deletes Senate earmark of \$962,000 for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. The House had no similar provision. The managers agree that within Special Programs/Pooled Overhead, \$962,000 is earmarked for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. In light of declining budgets, future funding for this program should be provided through non-Federal sources.

Amendment No. 55: Earmarks \$104,626,000 for contract support costs as proposed by the Senate instead of \$106,126,000 as proposed by the House and adds language earmarking \$100,255,000 for welfare assistance.

Amendment No. 56: Earmarks up to \$5,000,000 for the Indian Self-Determination Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57: Earmarks \$330,711,000 for school operations costs as proposed by the House instead of \$330,991,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Earmarks \$68,209,000 for higher education scholarships, adult vocational training, and assistance to public schools instead of \$67,138,000 as proposed by the House and \$69,477,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Retains a statutory reference to the Johnson O'Malley Act as proposed by the Senate. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 60: Earmarks \$71,854,000 for housing improvement, road maintenance, attorney fees, litigation support, self-governance grants, the Indian Self-Determination Fund, and the Navajo-Hopi settlement program instead of \$74,814,000 as proposed by the House and \$62,328,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Deletes a reference to trust fund management as proposed by the Senate. Responsibility for trust fund management has been transferred to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.

Amendment No. 62: Deletes reference to the statute of limitations language, as proposed by the Senate. This language is included in the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians (Amendment No. 80).

Amendment No. 63: Retains Senate language on the use of up to \$8,000,000 in unobligated balances for employee severance, relocation, and related expenses and inserts new language regarding the effective date when schools can adjust salary schedules. The House had no similar provision.

The managers agree that:

Under Other Recurring Programs \$409,000 is earmarked for Alaska legal services and salmon studies.

Not more than \$297,000 shall be available for a grant to the Close Up Foundation.

Amounts specifically earmarked within the bill for Tribal Priority Allocations are subject to the general reduction identified for Tribal Priority Allocations. The managers expect the Bureau to allocate the general reduction in a manner that will not jeopardize funding provided from the Highway Trust Fund for road maintenance. In addition, the general reduction should not be applied to the \$750,000 allocated for the Financial Management Improvement Team and for small and needy tribes. BIA should ensure that compacting and non-compacting tribes are treated consistently, except for compacting tribes who meet the criteria for small and needy tribes.

BIA should provide consistent treatment in allocating funds for small and needy tribes and new tribes. Allocations should be based on recommendations of the Joint Reorganization Task Force.

No funds are provided for the school statistics initiative. If the BIA wishes to pursue this initiative, the Committees will consider a reprogramming request.

Several steps must be completed before schools can adjust salary schedules. For this reason, bill language is included that will provide this authority beginning with the 1997-98 school year. The managers expect that within 30 days after enactment of this Act BIA should provide the Committees with a plan and time schedule advising how BIA will adjust salary schedules by the 1997-98 school year. The managers expect BIA to ensure that all necessary steps are taken to facilitate changes in salary rates for any schools desiring to use non-DOD pay rates.

\$16,338,000 from the Operation of Indian Programs should be transferred to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians (see Amendment No. 80).

The managers have agreed to a reduction of \$2,000,000 for education program management in the Central Office Operations program. No reduction has been included for

area and agency technical support in Other Recurring Programs. The managers expect the Bureau to review education program management at all levels to ensure that resources are properly allocated within the funding provided. If the Bureau wishes to reallocate the funds for these accounts, a reprogramming request should be submitted to the Committees.

The managers expect the Bureau of Indian Affairs to direct the U.S. Geological Survey to provide for the public release of all interpretations of data and reports (draft and final) completed under interagency agreement number AGP00473.94 and all related amendments immediately upon completion of the water studies. Within 15 days of enactment of this Act the BIA shall report to the Committees its decision as to whether or not it will direct the USGS to provide for the public release of the information. If the BIA does not allow for the public release of the information, the BIA should immediately cancel the interagency agreement with the USGS.

The managers have not agreed to the Senate amendment regarding a prohibition of the use of funds for travel and training expenses for the BIA. However, the BIA is expected to follow the guidance detailed in the discussion of Amendment No. 163.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$100,833,000 for construction instead of \$98,033,000 as proposed by the House and \$107,333,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the amount proposed by the House include increases of \$4,500,000 for the Chief Leschi School, and \$2,500,000 for the fire protection program, and decreases of \$3,700,000 for the Navajo irrigation project and \$500,000 for engineering and supervision.

The managers agree that the Chief Leschi School complex project will be phased in over a two-year period.

The managers agree that funding provided for construction projects should include the entire cost of a given project, which eliminates the need for a separate appropriation for contract support.

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$80,645,000 for Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians instead of \$75,145,000 as proposed by the House and \$82,745,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Earmarks \$78,600,000 for land and water claim settlements as proposed by the Senate instead of \$73,100,000 as proposed by the House. Changes to the amount proposed by the House include an increase of \$5,500,000 for the Ute Indian settlement.

Amendment No. 67: Earmarks \$1,000,000 for trust fund deficiencies as proposed by the House instead of \$3,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OF INDIAN ENTERPRISES

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$500,000 for technical assistance instead of \$900,000 as proposed by the Senate and no funds as proposed by the House.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,000,000 for guaranteed loans instead of \$7,700,000 as proposed by the Senate and no funds as proposed by the House.

The managers agree that \$4,500,000 is for the cost of guaranteed loans and \$500,000 is for administrative expenses.

TERRITORIAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates \$65,188,000 for Assistance to Territories instead of \$52,405,000 as proposed by the House and \$68,188,000 as proposed by the Senate. The changes to the amount proposed by the House include an increase of \$13,827,000 for territorial assistance and a decrease of \$1,044,000 for American Samoa operations grants. The amount provided for territorial assistance includes increases over the House of \$5,650,000 for technical assistance, \$2,400,000 for maintenance assistance, \$1,500,000 for management controls, and \$750,000 for disaster assistance.

Amendment No. 71: Earmarks \$3,527,000 for the Office of Insular Affairs as proposed by the Senate instead of no funds as proposed by the House. The managers agree that the Office of Territorial and International Affairs is abolished along with the Office of the Assistant for Territorial and International Affairs. The funding provided is for staff to carry out the Secretary's mandated responsibilities and is to be located under the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget. This action is consistent with the reorganization already approved by the Appropriations Committees.

Amendment No. 72: Retains Senate language directing the use of funds for technical assistance, maintenance assistance and disaster assistance.

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

Amendment No. 73: Deletes House proposed language and funding for impact aid to Guam as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree that Guam should be compensated for the impact caused by immigration from the freely associated states as authorized under the Compact of Free Association. Funding for compact impact shall be provided by a re-allocation of existing mandatory grant funds as discussed under Amendment No. 89.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment Nos. 74 and 75: The managers agree to the Senate language which changes the account name from Office of the Secretary to Departmental Management.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$57,796,000 for departmental management as proposed by the Senate instead of \$53,919,000 as proposed by the House. A redistribution has been made which includes reductions of \$296,000 to the Secretary's immediate office and \$51,000 to Congressional Affairs. These funds have been transferred to Central Services.

The managers agree that these accounts have been restrained over recent years and that coordination of the Department's programs, particularly during the ongoing downsizing and restructuring process, is critical to ensure the overall effectiveness of the Department's programs. However, the managers feel that it is important to restrain these offices at the 1995 level considering that most of the Department's programs have sustained reductions, or face elimination, and all are being directed to absorb their uncontrollable expenses. The managers also recognize the need to have flexibility in the Departmental Offices to manage within reduced funding levels and with the displacements and uncertainties caused by reductions-in-force. Therefore, the managers agree that the Department may reprogram funds without limitation among the program ele-

ments within the four activities. However, any reprogramming among the four activities must follow the normal reprogramming guidelines.

The managers strongly support language included in the House Report which encourages each agency to reduce levels of review and management in order to cover the costs associated with pay raises and inflation. The Department should carefully review and eliminate excessive or duplicated positions associated with Congressional and Public Affairs offices.

Amendment No. 77: Deletes Senate language which prohibits the use of official reception funds prior to the filing of the Charter for the Western Water Policy Review Commission. The House had no similar provision.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of no funding as proposed by the House.

The managers agree to retain the core policy function from the Office of Construction Management in the Office of Policy, Management and Budget. The balance of the programs are transferred to BIA construction.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

Amendment No. 79: Modifies language inserted by the Senate requiring a report detailing information on Indian tribes or tribal organizations with gaming operations. The modification changes the date the report is due to March 1, 1996. The House had no similar provision.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$16,338,000 for Federal trust programs in the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and establishes this new account as proposed by the Senate. The House had no similar provision.

The managers agree to the following transfers from the Operations of Indian Programs account within the Bureau of Indian Affairs as proposed by the Senate: \$3,047,000 from Other Recurring Programs for financial trust services; \$2,367,000 from Area Office Operations for financial trust services; and \$10,924,000 from Central Office Operations, including \$10,447,000 for the Office of Trust Funds Management.

The managers concur with the need for establishing the office as articulated in the Senate report. The managers believe that the Special Trustee will be effective in implementing reforms in the Bureau of Indian Affairs only to the extent that the Trustee has authority over the human and financial resources supporting trust programs. Lacking such authority, the Trustee cannot be held accountable and the likely result will be simply one more office pointing out the shortcomings of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Furthermore, under the current financial constraints facing the Committees and the various downsizing activities taking place in the Department, it is essential that the Committees have a clear understanding of the organizational structure supporting trust programs and an assurance that the significant general reductions proposed to be taken against the Bureau of Indian Affairs do not impair the Secretary's ability to manage trust assets. The managers are aware that there may be additional activities that could be transferred to the Office and encourage the Special Trustee, the Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the tribes, and the Office of Management and budget to work

closely with the appropriations and authorizing committees to identify the activities and related resources to be transferred.

Any increase in funding or staffing for the Office of Special Trustee should be considered within the context of the fiscal year 1997 budget request and with consideration for funding constraints and the downsizing occurring throughout the Department, particularly within the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The managers have recommended funding in a simplified budget structure to allow the Special Trustee some flexibility in establishing the office and the budget structure. Prior to submission of the fiscal year 1997 budget request, the managers expect the Special Trustee to work with the Committees to establish an appropriate budget structure for the Office.

The managers expect the Special Trustee to provide by December 1, 1996 a detailed operating plan for financial trust services for fiscal year 1996. The plan should detail what specific activities relating to the reconciliation effort will be undertaken, both directly by the Office of Special Trustee and by its contractors. The plan should detail what products will be provided to the tribes and the Congress and when such products will be submitted. The plan should include staffing for financial trust services, including the number of vacant positions and when the positions are expected to be filled.

Within the funds provided, support should be provided to the Intertribal Monitoring Association (ITMA). The managers expect ITMA to provide the Special Trustee with any information that is provided to the Appropriations or authorizing committees. If the Office of the Special Trustee plans to continue funding ITMA in fiscal year 1997, the managers expect the Special Trustee to identify the funds to be available for ITMA in the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

To the extent possible, the managers expect that administrative support services will continue to be provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs during fiscal year 1996. To the extent that resources exist within the Office of Special Trustee for budgeting or other administrative services, these activities should be provided by the Office of Special Trustee, rather than through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The managers have not included any funds for overhead costs, such as GSA rent, postage, FTS-2000, PAY/PERS, or workers' compensation. These costs should be paid from the Operation of Indian Programs account during fiscal year 1996. The fiscal year 1997 budget should include appropriate overhead amounts in the Office of the Special Trustee.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 81: Retains language inserted by the Senate changing the name of "Office of the Secretary" to "Departmental Management".

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 82: Deletes an unnecessary comma as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Retains the House language stricken by the Senate granting the Secretary of the Interior authority to transfer land acquisition funds between the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service.

Amendment No. 84: Modifies language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate regarding the expenditure of funds for the Presidio. The managers are aware of leg-

islation which may be enacted regarding the future management of the Presidio in California and have provided a funding limitation in order for the Congress to consider legislation this fall. In light of declining budgets, the managers recognize the need for an alternative approach for the Presidio that does not require additional appropriations from the Interior bill. Because the authorizing legislation may be enacted early in fiscal year 1996, the managers have included language which restricts how much funding can be obligated on a monthly basis for the first quarter of the fiscal year. However, if legislation is not enacted, the managers also recognize the need for National Park Service to be able to fulfill its management and resource protection responsibilities at the Presidio. Thus, the obligation limitation would be lifted on December 31, 1995.

Because of concerns about sufficient resources remaining available to address the requirements of any authorization regarding the Presidio Trust, the managers expect the National Park Service to notify the relevant House and Senate appropriations and authorizing committees before awarding any major contracts after December 31, 1995, and prior to the establishment of the Presidio Trust once it is authorized.

Amendment No. 85: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate repealing provisions of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 with respect to Outer Continental Shelf leases offshore North Carolina. The repeal of this statute is not intended to excuse the United States from the liabilities, if any, it has incurred to date nor to otherwise affect pending litigation.

Amendment No. 86: Retains language proposed by the Senate limiting the allocation of self-governance funds to Indian tribes in the State of Washington if a tribe adversely impacts rights of nontribal owners of land within the tribe's reservation. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 87: Retains language proposed by the Senate which requires the Department of the Interior to issue a specific schedule for the completion of the Lake Cushman Land Exchange Act within 30 days of enactment and to complete the exchange by September 30, 1996. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 88: Retains Senate language authorizing the National Park Service to expend funds for maintenance and repair of the Company Creek Road in Lake Chelan National Recreation Area and providing that, unless specifically authorized, no funds may be used for improving private property. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 89: Revises language proposed by the Senate to reallocate mandatory grant payments of \$27,720,000 to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI).

The managers agree that for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 the CNMI shall receive \$11,000,000 annually. This is consistent with total funding, matching requirements, and terms negotiated and set forth in the agreement executed on December 17, 1992, between the special representative of the President of the United States and the special representatives of the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The managers agree that Guam shall receive impact aid of \$4,580,000 in fiscal year 1996. This funding level shall continue through fiscal year 2001, as authorized by the Compact of Free Association. The managers agree that these grant funds must be used for infrastructure needs, as determined by the Government of Guam.

The managers agree that \$7,700,000 shall be allocated for capital improvement grants to American Samoa in fiscal year 1996 and that higher levels of funding may be required in future years to fund the highest priority projects identified in a master plan. The managers have agreed to language directing the Secretary to develop such a master plan in conjunction with the Government of American Samoa. The plan is to be reviewed by the Army Corps of Engineers before it is submitted to the Congress and is to be updated annually as part of the budget justification.

The managers understand that renovation of hospital facilities in American Samoa has been identified as one of the more critical and high priority needs. The Secretary of the Interior and the American Samoa Government are reminded that Congress required the creation of a hospital authority as a condition to Federal funding of health care facilities. The managers expect the existing hospital authority in American Samoa to be supported by the American Samoa Government so that it continues the purpose of improving the quality and management of health care.

The managers agree that \$4,420,000 shall be allocated in fiscal year 1996 for resettlement of Rongelap Atoll. Language has been included that total additional contributions, including funding provided in this bill, may not exceed \$32,000,000 and are contingent on an agreement that such contributions are a full and final settlement of all obligations of the United States to assist in the resettlement of Rongelap.

The managers have deleted language provisions proposed by the Senate which would legislate on several matters including minimum wage, immigration, and local employment in the Northern Mariana Islands.

The managers agree that the Secretary of the Interior should continue to submit an annual "State of the Islands" report. This report has been submitted for the past four years in accordance with Committee directives and is a valuable source of information for the Congress.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE FOREST RESEARCH

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$178,000,000 for forest research instead of \$182,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$177,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

For forestry research, the managers reaffirm support for the consolidation of budget line items, to provide the agency additional flexibility with restructuring, and to allow efficiencies and cost savings as require to meet funding reductions. The managers agree that no forest and range experiment station, research program, or research project should be held harmless from decreases that would impose disproportionate reductions to other research activities. The agency should maintain its focus on core research activities including forestry research that support initiatives relating both to public and private forest lands, and cooperative research efforts involving the universities as well as the private sector, directed at forest management, resource utilization and productivity. The managers urge the Forest Service to avoid location closures where research is not conducted elsewhere, and to consolidate programs that are spread over multiple locations. The managers are particularly concerned that silvicultural and hardwood utilization research continue given

the large number of public and private forests which rely on this research.

In addition, the managers note the growing importance of data and other information collected through the Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA) program and the resulting statewide forest inventories. The analysis and collection of information directed at forest health conditions on public and private forest lands has become especially important in recent years.

The managers have included \$300,000 for landscape management research at the University of Washington, \$479,000 for Cook County Ecosystem project, and \$200,000 for research at the Olympic Natural Resources Center in Forks, WA.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Amendment No. 91: Appropriates \$136,794,000 for State and private forestry as proposed by the Senate but deletes Senate earmarks for cooperative lands fire management and the stewardship incentives program. The House provided \$129,551,000 for State and private forestry.

The net increase above the House includes increases of \$4,500,000 for the stewardship incentives program, \$3,000,000 for forest legacy program, and \$5,500,000 for economic action programs; and reductions of \$2,000,000 from forest health management, \$621,000 from cooperative lands fire management, \$1,636,000 for forest stewardship and \$1,500,000 for urban and community forestry.

The managers agree to the following distribution of funds within economic action programs:

Forest products conservation and recovery	\$1,000,000
Economic recovery	5,000,000
Rural development	4,800,000
Wood in transportation	1,200,000
Columbia River Gorge, economic grants to counties	2,500,000

The managers agree that \$2,880,000 within rural development be allocated to the Northeast and Midwest, and that no funds are provided for economic diversification studies.

INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY

The managers agree that up to \$4,000,000 for Forest Service funds may be utilized for purposes previously funded through the International Forestry appropriation. Domestic activities requiring international contacts will continue to be funded, as in the past, by the appropriate domestic benefiting program. The managers reiterate their expectations that the Service curtail foreign travel expenditures in light of budget constraints.

Operations formerly funded by International Forestry or other appropriations, other than research activities, of the International Institute of Tropical Forestry, Puerto Rico and the Institute of Pacific Islands Forestry, Hawaii may continue to be funded as appropriate. As with other programs, it may be necessary to reduce funding for these institutes due to budget constraints. Research activities will be funded from the Forest Research appropriation.

The managers also expect the Forest Service to examine the best means to provide leadership in international forestry activities and meet essential representation and liaison responsibilities with foreign governments and international organizations, and agree that the Forest Service should not maintain a separate deputy chief for international forestry.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Amendment No. 92 Appropriates \$1,256,253,000 for the national forest system

instead of \$1,266,688,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,247,543,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The net decrease below the House consists of reductions of \$5,750,000 for recreation management, \$1,750,000 for wilderness management, \$435,000 for heritage resources, \$1,750,000 for wildlife habitat management, \$1,000,000 for inland fish habitat management, \$1,750,000 for threatened and endangered species habitat management; and increases of \$1,000,000 for road maintenance, and \$1,000,000 for facility maintenance.

The managers expect the land agencies to begin to rebuild and restore the public timber programs on national forests and BLM lands. With the modest increase in funding provided, the Forest Service is expected to produce 2.6 billion board feet of green sales. With enactment of the new salvage initiative (P.L. 104-19) in response to the emergency forest health situation, the agencies are expected to proceed aggressively to expedite the implementation of existing programmed salvage volumes, with the expectation that the Forest Service will produce an additional increment of 1.5 BBF over the expected sale program for fiscal year 1996. The managers expect a total fiscal year 1996 Forest Service sale accomplishment level off 5.6 BBF, and note that this is nearly half the level authorized for sale just five years ago. The Forest Service is to report timber sale accomplishments on the basis of net sawtimber sold and awarded to purchasers, and on the volume offered. Those regions of the country which sell products other than sawtimber should continue to report accomplishments in the same manner as used in the forest plans. The reports are to provide information on both green and salvage sales.

The managers encourage the Forest Service to use up to \$350,000 to commission a third party field review of the environmental impacts and the economic efficiency of the emergency forest salvage program mandated by section 2001 of P.L. 104-19. The managers believe that funding such a review can be appropriately undertaken through the timber salvage sale fund.

The managers note the difference between the House and Senate reports pertaining to tree measurement and timber scaling. The managers also note that House Report 103-551 specifically allow Forest Service managers to use scaling when selling salvage sales or thinnings. The managers expect the Forest Service to use fully the flexibility authorized in House Report 103-551 for rapidly deteriorating timber, and to use sample weight scaling for the sale of low value thinnings. Further, the managers direct the Forest Service to undertake a study to identify: (1) which measurement method is more cost efficient; (2) to assess what percent of timber theft cases involve scaling irregularities and whether tree measurement discourages timber theft; (3) which measurement method is more efficient when environmental modifications are needed after a sale has been awarded; and (4) assess the agency's ability to perform cruising required under tree measurement. The study will measure Forest Service performance based on Forest Service Handbook cruise standards, including identifying how often uncertified employees are involved in cruise efforts. The Forest Service shall contract with an established independent contractor skilled in both cruising and scaling and report back to the Committees no later than March 1, 1996.

The conference agreement includes \$400,000 for the development of a plan for preserving and managing the former Joliet Arsenal

property as a National tallgrass prairie. The managers are aware of legislation to establish the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie and urge the Forest Service to take such steps as are necessary, including a reprogramming, to begin implementing the legislation when enacted. The managers also urge the Forest Service to seek full funding for the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie as part of its fiscal year 1997 budget request.

The managers are concerned about the many programs in the President's Forest Plan designed to provide assistance to timber dependent communities in the Pacific Northwest. The managers are disturbed by the inability of the agencies involved to provide a detailed accounting of funds appropriated in previous fiscal years for the unemployed timber worker programs in the President's Forest Plan.

The managers expect the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare a detailed accounting and report of the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1995 for the President's Forest plan. The report shall include a careful accounting of appropriated funding, including: funds appropriated for timber production; administrative expenses, including the number of Federal employees employed to administer the various aspects of the President's plan; funds appropriated for the various jobs programs allowed for under the President's plan, including but not limited to the Jobs in the Woods program; the number of individuals employed by these programs; and the average length of each job. The managers expect the Secretaries to submit the report to the Committees no later than March 31, 1996.

The managers are concerned that the Forest Service reallocates funding pursuant to reprogramming requests before they are transmitted to Congress. The managers direct the Forest Service to adhere to the reprogramming guidelines, and not reallocate funds until the Appropriations Committees have had an opportunity to review these proposals.

The managers believe that additional opportunities exist for contracting Forest Service activities, and encourage expanding the use of contractors wherever possible.

WILDLIFE FIRE MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 93: Changes the account title to Wildland Fire Management as proposed by the Senate, instead of Fire Protection and Emergency Suppression as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 94: Appropriates \$385,485,000 for wildland fire management as proposed by the House instead of \$381,485,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$163,500,000 for construction, instead of \$120,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$186,888,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase above the House includes \$23,500,000 for facilities, \$5,000,000 for road construction, and \$15,000,000 for trail construction. Within the total for facilities, the conference agreement includes \$36,000,000 for recreation, \$10,000,000 for FA&O, and \$2,500,000 for research.

The managers agree to the following earmarks within recreation construction:

Allegheny NF, rehabilitation	\$150,000
Bead Lake, WA, boating access	60,000
Bead Lake, WA, roads	176,000
Columbia River Gorge Discovery Center, OR, completion	2,500,000
Cradle of Forestry, NC, utilities ..	500,000
Daniel Boone NF, KY, rehabilitation	660,000

Gum Springs Recreation Area, LA, rehabilitation phase II	400,000
Johnston Ridge Observatory, WA	500,000
Johnston Ridge Observatory, WA, roads	550,000
Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center, MT, completion	2,700,000
Multnomah Falls, OR, sewer system	190,000
Northern Great Lakes Visitor Center, WI	1,965,000
Seneca Rocks, WV visitor center, completion	1,400,000
Timberline Lodge, OR, water system improvements and new reservoir	750,000
Winding Stair Mountain National Recreation and Wilderness Area, OK, improvements	682,000

The managers agree that for the Northern Great Lakes Visitor Center, WI, funding is provided with the understanding that the project cost is to be matched 50% by the State of Wisconsin.

The conference agreement includes \$95,000,000 for roads to be allocated as follows: \$57,000,000 for timber roads, \$26,000,000 for recreation roads, and \$12,000,000 for general purpose roads.

The managers remain interested in Forest Service plans for restoring Grey Towers, and are concerned about the cost of the project. The managers expect the Forest Service to continue the implementation of the master plan for Grey Towers and to explore additional partnerships that can help cost-share required restoration work. The Forest Service should work with the Committees to provide a better understanding of the needs of Grey Towers and explore ways to reduce the cost to the Federal government.

The managers concur in the reprogramming request currently pending for Johnston Ridge Observatory and Timberline Lodge sewer system.

Amendment No. 96: Earmarks \$2,500,000 and unobligated project balances for a grant to the "Non-Profit Citizens for the Columbia Gorge Discovery Center," and authorizes the conveyance of certain land, as proposed by the Senate. The House included no similar provision.

Amendment No. 97: Includes Senate provision which authorizes funds appropriated in 1991 for a new research facility at the University of Missouri, Columbia, to be available as a grant for construction of the facility, and provides that the Forest Service shall receive free space in the building. The House had no similar provision.

LAND ACQUISITION

Amendment No. 98: Appropriates \$41,200,000 instead of \$14,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,167,000 as proposed by the Senate. The \$41,200,000 includes \$7,500,000 for acquisition management, \$2,000,000 for emergency and inholding purchases, \$1,000,000 for wilderness protection, \$1,725,000 for cash equalization of land exchanges, and \$28,975,000 for land purchase.

Amendment No. 99: Strikes Senate earmark for Mt. Jumbo.

Amendment No. 100: Strikes Senate earmark for Kane Experimental Forest.

The managers expect that any movement of acquisition funds from one project to another regardless of circumstances must follow normal reprogramming guidelines. The managers have deleted all references to specific earmarkings included in the Senate report.

The managers continue to encourage strongly the use of land exchanges as a way in which to protect important recreational

or environmentally significant lands, in lieu of the Federal Government acquiring lands. The managers believe that land exchanges represent a more cost-effective way in which to do business and encourage the Forest Service to give high priority to those exchanges either nearing completion, or where land management decisions are made particularly difficult due to checkerboard ownership.

The managers are concerned about the long history of problems associated with the implementation of land acquisition provisions in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Act. To date, nearly \$40 million has been spent on land acquisitions in the Gorge, and the Forest Service estimates that nearly \$20-\$30 million in remaining land is left to be acquired. The Gorge Act authorizes land exchanges in the area, and while several exchanges have been completed, a substantial number of acres remain to be acquired to fulfill the purposes of the Scenic Act. The managers strongly support the use of land exchanges versus land acquisitions. The managers understand that the Forest Service has the existing statutory authority to conduct land exchanges in the Scenic Area, including tripartite land-for-timber exchanges.

The managers encourage the Forest Service to enter into land exchanges, including tripartite land exchanges, with willing land owners in the Gorge to diminish the need for future acquisitions.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 101: Retains Senate provision which prohibits any reorganization without the consent of the appropriations and authorizing committees and adds a provision exempting the relocation of the Region 5 regional offices from the requirement to obtain the consent of the authorizing and appropriations committees. The House had no similar provision.

The managers are concerned that the Forest Service is being required to move the Regional Office in Atlanta, Georgia from its present location to a new Federal Center in downtown Atlanta at greatly increased costs. At the same time, accessibility for both the public and employees will be made more difficult. Requiring the Forest Service to absorb increased costs for no increase in effectiveness or efficiency is not acceptable. The managers agree that any relocation of the Atlanta office can occur only pursuant to the bill language restrictions which require the advance approval of the authorizing and appropriations committees. This will allow the committees the opportunity to examine closely the costs and benefits of any such proposal, and require the Administration to justify fully any additional expenditures.

Amendment No. 102: Includes Senate provision which adds the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to the list of committees which must approve reorganizations pursuant to amendment No. 101. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 103: Includes the Senate provision which adds the Committee on Resources to the list of committees which must approve reorganizations pursuant to amendment No. 101. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 104: Modifies Senate provision by deleting the prohibition on changes to the appropriations structure without advance approval of the Appropriations Committees, and substituting language allowing the relocation of the Region 5 regional office to Mare Island in Vallejo, CA, subject to the existing reprogramming guidelines. The House had no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes bill language which provides authority to finance costs associated with the relocation of the Region 5 regional office to excess military property at Mare Island Naval Shipyard at Vallejo, CA, from any Forest Service account. However, the managers expect a reprogramming request which justifies the relocation and identifies the source of funds to be used before funds are reallocated for this purpose. The allocation of other regions are not to be reduced in order to finance the move.

Amendment No. 105: Retains House language stricken by the Senate providing that 80 percent of the funds for the "Jobs in the Woods" program for National Forest land in the State of Washington be granted to the State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Senate had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 106: Deletes House provision relating to songbirds on the Shawnee NF. The Senate had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 107: Deletes Senate provision which prohibits revision or implementation of a new Tongass Land Management Plan. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 108: Modifies Senate provision requiring implementation of the Tongass Land Management Plan, Alternative P, during fiscal year 1996, and allows continuation of the current Tongass National Forest land management planning process which may replace or modify Alternative P. Language is also included relating to offering certain timber sales in Alaska, and making permanent section 502 of Public Law 104-19 relating to habitat conservation areas in the Tongass National Forest. The House had no similar provision.

The managers appreciate the critical need to resolve land and resource management issues relating to the Tongass National forest in Southeast Alaska and further recognize that, to date, the Congress has provided sufficient guidance and funding for the Forest Service to develop a workable land management plan. Therefore, the Forest Service is directed to implement the preferred alternative identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement dated October 1992 and its companion Record of Decision draft dated February 1993. The Forest Service may amend that plan to include a signed agreement between the Forest Service and the Alaska Visitors' Association, and is directed otherwise to proceed with timber sales and other plan features in accordance with this plan. The current plan revision process may continue, provided that any proposed revisions shall, to the maximum extent possible, contain no fewer acres of suitable timber lands than in the plan selected by this bill and any revision shall not take effect during fiscal year 1996.

Amendment No. 109: Includes Senate provision which prohibits applying paint to rocks or rock colorization. The House included no similar provision.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 110: Appropriates \$417,169,000 for fossil energy research and development instead of \$379,524,000 as proposed by the House and \$376,181,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amendment also provides for the transfer of authority for health and safety research in mines and the mineral industry from the Bureau of Mines (see amendment No. 47). Changes to the amount proposed by the House for coal research include an increase of \$2,000,000 for Kalina cycle testing and decreases of \$1,500,000 in coal preparation research, \$1,650,000 for HRI proof of

concept testing and \$1,000,000 for bench scale research in the direct liquefaction program, \$1,000,000 for in house research in the high efficiency integrated gasification combined cycle program, \$500,000 for filters testing and evaluation in the high efficiency pressurized fluidized bed program, and \$300,000 for international program support and \$1,000,000 for university coal research in advanced research and technology development. Changes to the amount proposed by the House for oil technology research include increases of \$1,500,000 for a data repository, \$250,000 for the gypsy field project and \$250,000 for the northern midcontinent digital petroleum atlas in exploration and supporting research, and decreases of \$1,000,000 for the National laboratory/industry partnership and \$1,000,000 for extraction in exploration and supporting research, \$2,000,000 for the heavy oil/unconsolidated Gulf Coast project in the recovery field demonstrations program, and \$1,100,000 as a general reduction to the processing research and downstream operations program. Changes to the amount proposed by the House for natural gas research include decreases of \$440,000 for conversion of natural gases to liquid fuels, \$130,000 for the international gas technology information center and \$30,000 for low quality gas upgrading in the utilization program and \$1,000,000 for the advanced concepts/tubular solid oxide fuel cell program. Other changes to the House recommended level include increases of \$40,000,000 for health and safety research (\$35 million) and materials partnerships (\$5 million) which are being transferred from the Bureau of Mines \$6,295,000 for cooperative research and development and \$5,000,000 for program direction at the energy technology centers and a decrease of \$4,000,000 for environmental restoration.

The funds provided for cooperative research and development include \$295,000 for technical and program management support and \$3,000,000 each for the Western Research Institute and the University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center. Within the funds provided for WRI and UNDEERC, the managers agree that a percentage comparable to the fiscal year 1995 rate may be used for the base research program, and the balance is to be used for the jointly sponsored research program.

The managers have included an increase of \$5,000,000 for program direction, which is \$1,000,000 less than recommended in the Senate bill. The managers expect the Department to allocate these funds commensurate with the program distributions in this bill. The various program and support functions of the field locations should continue to be funded out of the same line-items as in fiscal year 1995.

The managers are aware of proposals regarding the future field office structure of the fossil energy program. The managers take no position on the specifics of the various aspects of the strategic realignment initiative at this time as many of the details are not yet available. The managers expect the Department to comply fully with the reprogramming guidelines before proceeding with implementation of any reorganization or relocation. The managers are concerned about the basis for estimated savings, personnel impacts, budget changes, transition plans, and how any proposed integration will address market requirements and utilization.

In any proposal to privatize the National Institute for Petroleum and Energy Research (NIPER), the Department should seek competitively a non-Federal entity to acquire

NIPER and to make such investments and changes as may be necessary to enable the private entity to perform high-value research and development services and compete with other organizations for private and public sector work. In the interim, to the extent the program level for oil technology allows, the Department is encouraged to maintain as much of the program at NIPER as possible.

With respect to the functions of the Bureau of Mines which have been transferred to the Department of Energy, the managers expect the Department to continue to identify the resources being allocated for these purposes and not to subsume these functions into other budget line-items within the fossil energy account. The Secretary should maintain the transferred functions and personnel at their current locations. In fiscal year 1996, any staffing reductions required to accommodate the funding level provided for health and safety research should be taken from within this activity and should not affect any other elements of the fossil energy research and development organization. Likewise, any additional or vacant positions which are required for the health and safety research function should be filled with Bureau of Mines employees who are subject to termination or reduction-in-force. The managers strongly encourage the Administration, and particularly the Office of Management and Budget, to work toward consolidating these health and safety functions in the same agency with either the Mine Safety and Health Administration or the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

The managers do not object to the use of up to \$18,000,000 in clean coal technology program funds for administration of the clean coal program. The managers are concerned that a clean coal project was recently changed without addressing Congressional concerns that were raised before and during the application review period. The managers expect the Secretary, to the extent possible, to ensure that the sulfur dioxide facility which was approved as part of the NOXSO clean coal project is constructed so as to begin operation when the elemental sulfur is available from the NOXSO process. The managers also expect the Department to report to the legislative committees of jurisdiction as well as the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate on the rationale for approving the construction of a sulfur dioxide plant as part of the NOXSO project. As the remaining projects in the clean coal program proceed, the Department should focus on technologies that relate directly to the objectives of the program.

Amendment No. 111: Deletes language inserted by the Senate requiring that any new project start be substantially cost-shared with a private entity. The House had no similar provision. The managers expect the Department to make every effort to increase the percentage of non-Federal cost-sharing in its research and development projects.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Amendment No. 112: Appropriates \$148,786,000 for the Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves instead of \$151,028,000 as proposed by the House and \$136,028,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 113: Repeals the restriction on conducting studies with respect to the sale of the Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves as proposed by the Senate. The House had no similar provision.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Amendment No. 114: Appropriates \$553,293,000 for energy conservation instead

of \$556,371,000 as proposed by the House and \$576,976,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the amount proposed by the House for the buildings program include increases of \$150,000 for the foam insulation project in the building envelope program, \$100,000 for lighting and appliance collaboratives in commercial buildings in the building equipment program and \$1,140,000 for energy efficiency standards for Federal buildings in the codes and standards program, and decreases of \$400,000 for residential buildings/building America, \$3,000 for residential energy efficiency/climate change action plan, and \$1,500,000 for partnership America/climate change action plan in building systems; \$150,000 as a general reduction to materials and structures in building envelope; \$450,000 as a general reduction to lighting and \$100,000 for appliance technology introduction partnerships/climate change action plan in building equipment; and \$3,060,000 as a general reduction to the codes and standards program, consistent with the moratorium on issuing new standards (see amendment No. 157).

Changes to the amount proposed by the House for the industry program include an increase of \$3,000,000 in industrial wastes to maintain the NICE3 program at the fiscal year 1995 level and decreases of \$300,000 for combustion in the municipal solid waste program, \$1,000,000 as a general reduction to the metals initiative in the materials and metals processing program with the expectation that none of the reduction is to be applied to the electrochemical dezincing project, \$200,000 as a general reduction for alternative feedstocks and \$700,000 as a general reduction for process development in the other process efficiency program, and \$2,000,000 for environmental technology partnerships in implementation and deployment.

Changes to the amount proposed by the House for the transportation program include increases of \$990,000 for metal matrix composites in vehicle systems materials; \$200,000 for turbine engine technologies, \$200,000 for the ceramic turbine engine demonstration project, \$4,500,000 for automotive piston technologies, and \$612,000 for combustion and emissions research and development in heat engine technologies; and \$16,228,000 for on-board hydrogen proton exchange membrane fuel cells and \$2,900,000 for fuel cell research and development in electric and hybrid propulsion development. Decreases from the House include \$1,200,000 for fuel cells/battery materials and \$500,000 as a general reduction in materials technology; \$1,000,000 as a general reduction in vehicle systems materials; \$6,462,000 as a general reduction to light duty engine technologies in the heat engine technologies program; and \$500,000 for battery development, \$1,000,000 to terminate the phosphoric acid fuel cell bus program and \$15,528,000 as a general reduction for fuel cell development in the electric and hybrid propulsion development program.

Changes to the amount proposed by the House for the technical and financial assistance program include an increase of \$3,250,000 for the weatherization assistance program and a decrease of \$295,000 for the inventions and innovations program.

The managers have agreed to the Senate bill language restricting the issuance of new or amended standards in the codes and standards program (see amendment Nos. 156 and 157).

The managers agree that:

1. The Department should aggressively pursue increased cost sharing;
2. Projects that prove to be uneconomical or fail to produce desired results should be terminated;

3. The fiscal year 1997 budget should continue the trend of program downsizing with the focus on completing existing commitments;

4. Ongoing programs should not be grouped under the umbrella of large initiatives and described as new programs in the budget;

5. There should be no new program starts without compelling justification and identified funding offsets;

6. The home energy rating system pilot program should be continued with the existing pilot States; within the funds available for HERS, the managers expect the department to work with Mississippi and other non-pilot program States on the States' home energy rating system;

7. There is no objection to continuing the student vehicle competition in the transportation program at the current year funding level;

8. The Department should work with the States to determine what other programs should be included in a block grant type program along with the consolidated State energy conservation program/institutional conservation program;

9. There is no objection to continuing the interagency agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development for public assisted housing and other low-income initiatives to the extent that HUD reimburses the Department for this work;

10. The Office of Industrial Technologies may procure capital equipment using operating funds, subject to the existing reprogramming guidelines;

11. The Department should work with the Office of Management and Budget and the General Services Administration to ensure that agencies fund energy efficiency improvements in Federal buildings;

12. The Department should increase private sector investment through energy savings performance contracts in the Federal energy management program and should develop mechanisms to be reimbursed for these efforts;

13. The Department should submit a new five year program plan for the transportation program in light of current funding constraints; and

14. There are no specific restrictions on the number of contracts to be let for the long term battery development effort or activities within the electric and hybrid vehicle program. Given the level of funding provided, the Department should examine carefully its options in these areas in close coordination with its industry cooperators.

Amendment No. 115: Earmarks \$140,696,000 for State energy grant programs instead of \$148,946,000 as proposed by the House and \$168,946,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 116: Earmarks \$114,196,000 for the weatherization assistance program instead of \$110,946,000 as proposed by the House and \$137,446,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 117: Earmarks \$26,500,000 for the State energy conservation program as proposed by the House instead of \$31,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ECONOMIC REGULATION

Amendment No. 118: Appropriates \$6,297,000 for economic regulation as proposed by the House instead of \$8,038,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree that the Office of Hearings and Appeals should receive reimbursement for work other than petroleum overcharge cases and related activities are recommended by the House.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 119: Appropriates \$72,266,000 for the Energy Information Ad-

ministration instead of \$79,766,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,766,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers expect the reduction to be applied largely to EIA's forecasting efforts.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Amendment No. 120: Appropriates \$1,722,842,000 for Indian health services instead of \$1,725,792,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,815,373,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the amount proposed by the House include increases of \$1,500,000 for collections and billings, \$750,000 for epidemiology centers, \$200,000 for the Indians into Psychology program, and decreases of \$2,000,000 for Indian health professionals, \$3,000,000 for tribal management, and a \$400,000 transfer from hospitals and clinics to facilities and environmental health support.

Amendment No. 121: Earmarks \$350,564,000 for contract medical care as proposed by the Senate instead of \$351,258,000 as proposed by the House.

The managers agree that the Indian Self Determination Fund is to be used only for new and expanded contracts and that this fund may be used for self-governance compacts only to the extent that a compact assumes new or additional responsibilities that had been performed by the IHS.

The managers agree that the fetal alcohol syndrome project at the University of Washington should be funded at the fiscal year 1995 level.

The managers are concerned about the adequacy of health care services available to the Utah Navajo population, and urge IHS to work with the local health care community to ensure that the health care needs of the Utah Navajos are being met. IHS should carefully consider those needs in designing a replacement facility for the Montezuma Creek health center.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Amendment No. 122: Appropriates \$238,958,000 for Indian health facilities instead of \$236,975,000 as proposed by the House and \$151,227,000 as proposed by the Senate. Changes to the amount proposed by the House include increases of \$750,000 for the Alaska medical center, \$1,000,000 for modular dental units, \$500,000 for injury prevention, \$400,000 for a base transfer from hospitals and clinics, and a decrease of \$667,000 for the Fort Yuma, AZ project.

The managers agree to delay any reprogramming of funds from the Winnebago and Omaha Tribes' health care facility. However, given current budget constraints, if issues relative to the siting and design of the facility cannot be resolved, the managers will consider reprogramming these funds to other high priority IHS projects during fiscal year 1996.

The Talihina, OK hospital is ranked sixth on the IHS health facilities priority list for inpatient facilities. The Choctaw Nation had developed a financing plan for a replacement facility. The Choctaw Nation proposes various funding sources to support its project for a community based hospital. The managers direct IHS to work with the Choctaw Nation to identify resources necessary to staff, equip, and operate the newly constructed facility. The managers will consider these operational needs in the content of current budget constraints.

The managers have not agreed to provisions in the Senate bill requiring the IHS to prepare reports on the distribution of Indian Health Service professionals and on HIV-

AIDs prevention needs among Indian tribes. While the managers agree that closer examination of these topics may be warranted, the resources necessary to conduct adequate studies are not available at this time.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INDIAN EDUCATION

Amendment No. 123: Appropriates \$52,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$54,660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree that no funding is provided for the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 124: Appropriates \$20,345,000 for the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,345,000 as proposed by the House.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates \$308,188,000 for Salaries and Expenses instead of \$309,471,000 as proposed by the House and \$307,988,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The \$200,000 increase is provided for the Center for folklife programs specifically for the 1996 Festival of American Folklife featuring the State of Iowa. This amount is provided in addition to the \$400,000 base funding. The State of Iowa will contribute \$250,000 toward this effort.

Amendment No. 126: Earmarks \$30,472,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$32,000,000 proposed by the House for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition and various other programs.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Amendment No. 127: Appropriate \$3,250,000 for zoo construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase is limited to repairs and rehabilitation and is not to be used for new exhibits or expansions.

REPAIR AND RESTORATION OF BUILDINGS

Amendment No. 128: Appropriates \$33,954,000 for repair and restoration of buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of \$24,954,000 as proposed by the House.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 129: Appropriates \$27,700,000 for Construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,950,000 as proposed by the House. The managers agree that \$15,000,000 is included for the National Museum of the American Indian Cultural Resource Center; \$8,700,000 is included to complete the construction and equipping of the Natural History East Court Building and \$3,000,000 is for minor construction, alterations and modifications.

The managers are providing \$1,000,000 to be used to complete a proposed master plan and initiate detailed planning and design to allow for the development of a proposed financial plan for the proposed extension at Dulles Airport for the Air and Space Museum. The managers expect that the financial plan shall specify, in detail, the phasing of the project and commitments by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Smithsonian toward construction and operation of the facility.

The managers agree that no Federal funds, beyond the costs of planning and design, will

be available for the construction phase of this project.

The managers have provided \$15,000,000 for the continued construction of the National Museum of the American Indian Cultural Resource Center in Suitland, Maryland. This amount will bring the Federal contribution to date for this project to \$40,900,000. The managers have agreed that no additional Federal funds will be appropriated for this project.

The managers also strongly encourage the Smithsonian to develop alternative cost scenarios for the proposed National Museum of the American Indian Mall Museum including downsizing of the building and decreasing the amount of Federal funding.

Amendment No. 130: The managers agree to concur with the Senate amendment which strikes the House provision permitting a single procurement for construction of the American Indian Cultural Resources Center. The managers understand that authority provided previously for such purposes is sufficient.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 131: Appropriates \$51,844,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$51,315,000 as proposed by the House.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Amendment No. 132: Appropriates \$6,442,000 for repair, restoration and renovation of buildings instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,385,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 133: Appropriates \$10,323,000 for operations and maintenance as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$9,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 134: Includes Senate provision which amends 40 U.S.C. 193n to provide the Kennedy Center with the same police authority as the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art. The House had no similar provision.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 135: Appropriates \$5,840,000 for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars instead of \$5,840,100 as proposed by the House and \$6,537,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers continue to have serious concerns about the total costs associated with the proposed move to the Federal Triangle building. Until such time as both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees' concerns are satisfactorily addressed, no funds may be used for this purpose.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 136: Appropriates \$82,259,000 for grants and administration as proposed by the House instead of \$88,765,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 137: Deletes House language making NEA funding contingent upon passage of a House reauthorization bill. The Senate had no similar provision.

The managers on the part of the House continue to support termination of NEA within two years, and do not support funding

beyond FY 1997. The managers on the part of the Senate take strong exception to the House position, and support continued funding for NEA. The managers expect this issue to be resolved by the legislative committees in the House and Senate.

MATCHING GRANTS

Amendment No. 138: Appropriates \$17,235,000 for matching grants as proposed by the House instead of \$21,235,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 139: Deletes House language making funding for NEA contingent upon passage of a House reauthorization bill.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 140: Appropriates \$94,000,000 for grants and administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$82,469,000 as proposed by the House.

The managers on the part of the House continue to support a phase out of NEH within three years, and do not support funding beyond FY 1998. The managers on the part of the Senate take strong exception to the House position, and support continued funding for NEH. The managers expect this issue to be resolved by the legislative committees in the House and Senate.

MATCHING GRANTS

Amendment No. 141: Appropriates \$16,000,000 for matching grants as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,025,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 142: Earmarks \$10,000,000 for challenge grants as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,180,000 as proposed by the House.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 143: Appropriates \$2,500,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,063,000 as proposed by the House.

While the Advisory Council works closely with Federal agencies and departments, the National Park Service and State historic preservation officers, it does not have responsibility for designating historic properties, providing financial assistance, overriding other federal agencies' decisions, or controlling actions taken by property owners.

The managers encourage those Federal agencies and departments which benefit from the Advisory Council's expert advice to assist in covering these costs. The managers are concerned that some Advisory Council activities may duplicate those conducted by other preservation agencies. Therefore, the managers direct the Advisory Council to evaluate ways to recover the costs of assisting Federal agencies and departments through reimbursable agreements and to examine its program activities to identify ways to eliminate any duplication with other agencies. The Advisory Council shall report its findings to the Congress by March 31, 1996.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 144: Appropriates \$147,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$48,000 as proposed by the House.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 145: Appropriates no funds as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 146: Modifies language proposed by the Senate allowing the use of prior year funding for operating and administrative expenses. The modification allows the use of prior year funding for shutdown costs in addition to operating costs. In addition, prior year funds may be used to fund activities associated with the functions transferred to the General Services Administration. The House had no similar provision.

The managers agree that not more than \$3,000,000 in prior year funds can be used for operating, administrative expenses, and shutdown costs for the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation. The managers direct that the orderly shutdown of the Corporation be accomplished within six months from the date of enactment of this Act. No staff should be maintained beyond April 1, 1996. The managers agree that Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation staff associated with the Federal Triangle project should be transferred to the General Services Administration, and provision for the transfer has been included in the Treasury-Postal Services Appropriations bill.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

Amendment No. 147: Appropriates \$28,707,000 for the Holocaust Memorial Council as proposed by the House instead of \$26,609,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 148: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate providing that \$1,264,000 for the Museum's exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 149: Retains Senate provision making a technical correction to Public Law 103-413.

Amendment No. 150: Includes Senate provision that any funds used for the Americorps program are subject to the reprogramming guidelines, and can only be used if the Americorps program is funded in the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. The House prohibited the use of any funds for the Americorps program.

Since the Northwest Service Academy (NWSA) is funded through fiscal year 1996, the managers agree that the agencies are not prohibited from granting the NWSA a special use permit, from using the NWSA to accomplish projects on agency-managed lands or in furtherance of the agencies' missions, or from paying the NWSA a reasonable fee-for-service for projects.

Amendment No. 151: Modifies House language stricken by the Senate transferring certain responsibilities from the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation to the General Services Administration, National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Park Service. The modification transfers all unobligated and unexpended balances to the General Services Administration. The Senate had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 152: Modifies House and Senate provisions relating to the Interior Columbia River Basin ecoregion management project (the Project). The House and Senate contained different language on the subject, but both versions were clear in their position that the Project has grown too large, and too costly to sustain in a time of shrinking budgets. In addition, the massive nature of the undertaking, and the broad geographic scope of the decisions to be made as part of a single project has raised concerns

about potential vulnerability to litigation and court injunctions with a regionwide impact. The language included in the conference report reflects a compromise between the two versions.

Subsection (b) appropriated \$4,000,000 for the completion of an assessment on the National forest system lands and lands administered by the BLM within the area encompassed by the Project, and to publish two draft Environmental Impact Statements on the Project. The Forest Service and BLM should rely heavily on the eastside forest ecosystem health assessment in the development of the assessment and DEIS's, in particular, volume II and IV provide a significant amount of the direction necessary for the development of an ecosystem management plan. This document has already been peer reviewed and widely distributed to the public. Therefore, the collaborative efforts by many scientists can be recognized.

The two separate DEIS's would cover the project region of eastern Washington and Oregon, and the project region of Montana and Idaho, and other affected States. The language also directs project officials to submit the assessment and two DEIS's to the appropriate House and Senate committees for their review. The DEIS's are not decisional and not subject to judicial review. The managers have included this language based upon concern that the publication of DEIS's of this magnitude would present the opportunity for an injunction that would shut down all multiple use activities in the region.

The assessment shall contain a range of alternatives without the identification of a preferred alternative or management recommendation. The assessment will also provide a methodology for conducting any cumulative effects analysis required by section 102(2) of NEPA, in the preparation of each amendment to a resource management plan.

The assessment shall also include the scientific information and analysis conducted by the Project on forest and rangeland health conditions, among other considerations, and the implications of the management of these conditions. Further, the assessment and DEIS's shall not be subject to consultation or conferencing under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, nor be accompanied by any record of decision required under NEPA.

Subsection (c) states the objective of the managers that the district manager of the Bureau of Land Management or the forest supervisor of the Forest Service use the DEIS's as an information base for the development of individual plan amendments to their respective forest plan. The managers believe that the local officials will do the best job in preparing plan amendments that will achieve the greatest degree of balance between multiple use activities and environmental protection.

Upon the date of enactment, the land managers are required to review their resource management plan for their forest, together with a review of the assessment and DEIS's, and based on that review, develop or modify the policies laid out in the DEIS or assessment to meet the specific conditions of their forest.

Based upon this review, subsection (c)(2) directs the forest supervisor or district manager to prepare and adopt an amendment to meet the conditions of the individual forest. In an effort to increase the local participation in the plan amendment process, the district manager or forest supervisor is directed to consult with the governor, and affected

county commissioners and tribal governments in the affected area.

Plan amendments should be site specific, in lieu of imposing general standards applicable to multiple sites. If an amendment would result in a major change in land use allocations within the forest plan, such an amendment shall be deemed a significant change, and therefore requiring a significant plan amendment or equivalent.

Subsection (c)(5) strictly limits the basis for individual plan amendments in a fashion that the managers intend to be exclusive.

Language has been included to stop duplication of environmental requirements. Subsection (c)(6)(A) states that any policy adopted in an amendment that modifies, or is an alternative policy, to the general policies laid out in the DEIS's and assessment document that has already undergone consultation or conferencing under section 7 of the ESA, shall not again be subject to such provisions. If a policy has not undergone consultation or conferencing under section 7 of the ESA, or if an amendment addresses other matters, however, then that amendment shall be subject to section 7.

Amendments which modify or are an alternative policy are required to be adopted before July 31, 1996. An amendment that is deemed significant, shall be adopted on or before December 31, 1996. The policies of the Project shall no longer be in effect on a forest on or after December 31, 1996, or after an amendment to the plan that applies to that forest is adopted, whichever comes first.

The managers have included language specific to the Clearwater National Forest, as it relates to the provisions of this section. The managers have also included language to clarify that the documents prepared under this section shall not apply to, or be used to regulate non-Federal lands.

Amendment No. 153: Includes a modified version of provisions included by both the House and Senate relating to a recreational fee demonstration program. This pilot program provides for testing a variety of fee collection methods designed to improve our public lands by allowing 80 percent of fees generated to stay with the parks, forests, refuges and public lands where the fees are collected. There is a tremendous backlog of operational and maintenance needs that have gone unmet, while at the same time visits by the American public continue to rise. The public is better served and more willing to pay reasonable user fees if they are assured that the fees are being used to manage and enhance the sites where the fees are collected.

Most of the provisions of the Senate amendment are incorporated into the amendment agreed to by the managers, which provides for the following:

(1) The maximum number of demonstration sites per agency is extended from 30 to 50.

(2) The time period for the demonstration is extended from one year to three years and these funds remain available for three years after the demonstration period ends.

(3) Agencies may impose a fine of up to \$100 for violation of the authority to collect fees established by this program.

(4) The more simplified accounting procedures proposed by the Senate are adopted, such that fewer Treasury accounts need to be established than proposed by the House.

(5) In those cases where demonstrations had fee collections in place before this provision, fees above the amounts collected in 1995 (plus 4% annually) are to be used for the benefit of the collection site or on an agency-

wide basis. The other fees collected will be treated like they are at non-demonstration sites, except funds withheld to cover fee collection costs for agencies other than the Fish and Wildlife Service will remain available beyond the fiscal year in which they are collected.

(6) For those Fish and Wildlife Service demonstrations where fees were collected in fiscal year 1995, the fees collected, up to the 1995 level (plus 4% annually), are disbursed as they were in 1995.

(7) The agencies have been provided more latitude in selecting demonstration sites, areas or projects. These demonstrations may include an entire administrative unit, such as a national park or national wildlife refuge where division into smaller units would be difficult to administer or where fee collections would adversely affect visitor use patterns.

(8) The Secretaries are directed to select and design the demonstration projects in a manner which will provide optimum opportunities to evaluate the broad spectrum of resource conditions and recreational opportunities on Federal lands, including facility, interpretation, and fish and wildlife habitat enhancement projects that enhance the visitor experience.

(9) Vendors may charge a reasonable mark-up or commission to cover their costs and provide a profit.

(10) Each Secretary shall provide the Congress a brief report describing the selected sites and fee recovery methods to be used by March 31, 1996, and a report which evaluates the pilot demonstrations, including recommendations for further legislation, by March 31, 1999. The reports to Congress are to include a discussion of the different sites selected and how they represent the geographical and programmatic spectrum of recreational sites and habitats managed by the agencies. The diversity of fee collection methods and fair market valuation methods should also be explained.

(11) In order to maximize funding for start-up costs, agencies are encouraged to use existing authority in developing innovative implementation strategies, including cooperative efforts between agencies and local governments.

(12) Although the managers have not included the Senate amendment language regarding geographical discrimination on fees, the managers agree that entrance, tourism, and recreational fees should reflect the circumstances and conditions of the various States and regions of the country. In setting fees, consideration should be given to fees charged on comparable sites in other parts of the region or country. The four agencies are encouraged to cooperate fully in providing additional data on tourism, recreational use, or rates which may be required by Congress in addressing the fee issue.

(13) The managers request that the General Accounting Office conduct a study and report to the Appropriations Committees by July 31, 1996 on the methodology and progress made by the Secretaries to implement this section.

Amendment No. 154: Deletes House language relating to salvage timber sales in the Pacific Northwest, and substitutes language which makes a technical correction to the emergency salvage timber program, Sec. 2001(a)(2) of Public Law 104-19 that changes the ending date of the emergency period to December 31, 1996. This correction is necessary to conform to the expiration date in Sec. 2001(j). The Senate included no similar provision.

Amendment No. 155: Retains the House language stricken by the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for the Mississippi River Corridor Heritage Commission.

Amendment No. 156: Deletes House language stricken by the Senate placing a moratorium on the issuance of new or amended standards and reducing the codes and standards program in the Department of Energy by \$12,799,000 and inserts language regarding grazing at Great Basin National Park. The codes and standards issue is discussed under the energy conservation portion of this statement.

Amendment No. 157: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate and retains Senate alternative language providing for a one-year moratorium on new or amended standards by the Department of Energy. This issue is discussed under the energy conservation portion of this statement.

Amendment No. 158: Modifies House mining patent moratorium that was stricken and replaced by the Senate with fair market value legislation for mining patents. The conference agreement continues the existing moratorium on the issuance of mining patents that was contained in the fiscal year 1995 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act until (1) a concurrent resolution containing reconciliation instructions for fiscal year 1996 is enacted into law that contains provisions relating to the patenting of, and payment of royalties to, such claims, or (2) an agreement is approved by both the House and Senate in an identical form on other legislation containing provisions relating to the patenting of, payment of royalties on, and reclamation of such claims. In the latter case, reclamation will be defined in any such legislation.

The agreement further requires the Secretary of the Interior within three months of the enactment of this Act to file with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the authorizing committees a plan which details how the Department will take final action on at least 90 percent of such applications within three years of enactment of this Act, and take such actions as necessary to carry out such plan. In order to process more expeditiously the class of exempted patent applications that are allowed to proceed under the moratorium, the Secretary shall require an applicant to fund the retention by the Bureau of Land Management of a qualified third-party contractor to conduct a mineral examination of the mining claims or mill sites contained in the patent application. BLM will have sole responsibility to choose and pay the third-party contractor.

Amendment No. 159: Includes the Senate provision which prohibits funding for the Office of Forestry and Economic Development after December 31, 1995. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 160: Retains language inserted by the Senate prohibiting redefinition of the marbled murrelet nesting area or modification to the protocol for surveying marbled murrelets. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 161: Retains language inserted by the Senate authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to exchange land in Washington State with the Boise Cascade Corporation. The House had no similar language.

Amendment No. 162: Includes Senate provision which creates a new Timber Sales Pipeline Restoration Fund at the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to partially finance the preparation of timber sales from the revenues generated from the section 318

timber sales that are released under section 2001(k) of Public law 104-19. The House included no similar provision.

Amendment No. 163: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would prohibit use of funds for travel and training expenses for the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Office of Indian Education for education conferences or training activities.

The managers expect the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Indian Education to monitor carefully the funds used for travel and training activities. The managers are concerned about the cost of travel and training associated with national conferences attended by school board members or staff of schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Because of the funding constraints faced by the Bureau, the managers expect that priority will be given to funding those activities which directly support accreditation of Bureau funded schools and covering costs associated with increased enrollment.

Amendment No. 164: Retains language inserted by the Senate prohibiting the award of grants to individuals by the National Endowment for the Arts except for literature fellowships, National Heritage fellowships and American Jazz Masters fellowships. The House had no similar provisions.

Amendment No. 165: Includes Senate provision which delays implementation or enforcement of the Administration's rangeland reform program until November 21, 1995. The House included no similar provision.

Amendment No. 166: Strikes Senate section 331 pertaining to submission of land acquisition projects by priority ranking. Priorities should continue to be identified in the budget request and justifications.

Amendment No. 167: Includes Senate provision that makes three changes to existing law relating to tree spiking. Costs incurred by Federal agencies, businesses and individuals to detect, prevent and avoid damage and injury from tree spiking, real or threatened, may be included as "avoidance costs" in meeting the threshold of \$10,000 required for prosecution. The language doubles the discretionary maximum penalties for prison terms to 40 years for incidents resulting in the most severe personal injury. Those injured would have recourse to file civil suits to recover damages under this law. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 168: Modifies Senate language restricting grants that denigrate adherents to a particular religion. The modification specifies that this restriction applies to NEA and incorporates Senate language from Amendment No. 169 restricting NEA Grants for sexually explicit material. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 169: Deletes Senate language restricting NEA grants for sexually explicit material. This issue is addressed in Amendment No. 168.

Amendment No. 170: Deletes language inserted by the Senate extending the scope of the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act. The House had no similar provision. The amendment also inserts language providing that former Bureau of Mines activities, which are being transferred to other accounts, are paid for from those accounts for all of fiscal year 1996 and changes a section number.

Amendment No. 171: Deletes language inserted by the Senate mandating energy savings at Federal facilities. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 172: Deletes Senate amendment requiring the Indian Health Service to prepare a report on the distribution of Indian Health Service professionals. The House had no similar provision.

Amendment No. 173: Deletes Senate amendment requiring the Indian Health Service to prepare a report on HIV-AIDS prevention needs among Indian tribes. The House had no similar provision.

APPLICATION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS

The level at which reductions shall be taken pursuant to the Deficit Reduction Act of 1985, if such reductions are required in fiscal year 1996, is defined by the managers as follows:

As provided for by section 2576(1)(2) of Public Law 99-177, as amended, and for the purposes of a Presidential Order issued pursuant to section 254 of said Act, the term "program, project, and activity" for items under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the House of Representatives and the Senate is defined as (1) any item specifically identified in tables or written material set forth in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, or accompanying committee reports or the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference; (2) any Government-owned or Government-operated facility; and (3) management units, such as national parks, national forests, fish hatcheries, wildlife refuges, research units, regional, State and other administrative units and the like, for which funds are provided in fiscal year 1996.

The managers emphasize that any item for which a specific dollar amount is mentioned in an accompanying report, including all changes to the budget estimate approved by the Committees, shall be subject to a percentage reduction no greater or less than the percentage reduction applied to all domestic discretionary accounts.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1996 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1995 amount, the 1996 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1996 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	\$13,519,230,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	13,817,404,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	11,984,603,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	12,053,099,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1996	12,114,636,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995 ..	-1,404,594,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	-1,702,768,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	+130,033,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	+61,537,000

RALPH REGULA,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
JIM KOLBE,
JOE SKEEN,
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,
CHARLES H. TAYLOR,
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT,
JR.,
JIM BUNN,
BOB LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SLADE GORTON,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
CONRAD BURNS,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
CONNIE MACK,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
PATRICK J. LEAHY (EXCEPT
AMENDMENTS 136, 138, 168,
AND 169),
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
HARRY REID,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1830

MESSAGE TO SPEAKER GINGRICH: AGREE TO RAISE DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRYCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are addressed to Speaker GINGRICH, and I hope he is listening, or some of his staff is listening, because this is a very serious subject.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, you are going down and visit with the President of the United States in the Oval Office and talk about the debt ceiling. I know, Mr. Speaker, you made some off-the-cuff remarks a couple of months ago saying that you did not care if the Government went into default for a couple of months. At least that is the way I remember it being reported.

I know that those were casual remarks and some that you gave without thinking through the situation, but there is a very serious problem.

Now, it is not a political problem, Mr. Speaker, because let me make it very clear. Every Republican Member of the House and the Senate has voted to increase the debt ceiling on perhaps as many as three times this year and they have agreed to increase the ceiling to \$5.500 trillion, so the amount is not in question. The only thing in question is when you are going to take the final step and take the effective date.

Now, I do not know what motivates you, Mr. Speaker, but this could be a very expensive matter, and I hope you will not take it offensively if I say that you could blemish the credit of the United States, a credit that stretches back over 200 years.

We have never defaulted on our debt and we are right at default and tomorrow, tomorrow is a crucial day in the

lead time that is necessary in order to extend this debt and prevent a default.

Now, that is not only important for the U.S. Government, but it is important for everybody that lives in the United States, because it means if we increase the uneasiness about the debt and we actually default, there will be a premium added to the cost of money that we borrow.

Not only will there be premium to that money, but there will be a premium to all other borrowing in the United States because the obligation, the debt of the United States always attracts the lowest interest rate and everybody's goes up from there. So if the debt of the United States is sold for more than a reasonable going price because of the uncertainty, then everybody else's debt goes up; the whole economy is destabilized; unemployment can increase. So, this is a very serious matter.

Now, as you have been told as recently as today and five or six times since June, November 15 is the drop-dead. On November 15, the U.S. Government has got to put out a debt that will raise \$125 billion. Let me repeat that again: \$125 billion. Now, this market is over 200 years old and it is accustomed to operating in certain ways and there are certain rules and regulations that have been imposed upon it.

Those rules begin to toll tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock when the Treasury opens for business. If the rules are followed tomorrow morning, the Treasury must notify the market that they will be offering for purchase debt obligations of the United States in the amount of around \$125 billion.

Now, it will take the rest of the week, all of the 24 hours in the day, to sell that debt. The market responds very rapidly, but nobody keeps \$125 billion cash in their accounts. The market must operate and go out there and the more orderly that it is done, the lower and the better the interest rate is.

If there is confusion in the market, then the shark folks demand higher interest and that higher interest will ripple through the economy instantaneously.

So, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a very important day, and it will take the market until the end of the week to sell that debt. If the Government cannot sell the debt on next Monday, or if it has been hurried because of your actions. Mr. Speaker, in not letting us vote on this question, then it is going to cost us all money, every borrower in the United States. It is going to cost more money, no matter if it is for a car, a home, or anything else.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be reckless. Let us go ahead and let the House vote on setting the effective date. The amount of money has already been agreed to, and trying to use this as some kind of leverage in a bargaining

process has never worked in 200 years. It will not work now. It will only cost us money.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury dated today directed to Speaker GINGRICH and others.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, October 31, 1995.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In anticipation of our meeting tomorrow I want to provide information that you should have as background for your consideration of our request for a prompt increase in the debt limit.

First, I have set forth in an appendix both our current projections and a history of our projections over the past several months.

Second, I want to make clear that if Congress fails to act by Wednesday, November 1, it will disrupt our normal auction process and could force Treasury to take additional actions that involve the interests of federal retirees, commercial banks, and purchasers of savings bonds.

As you know from my letter of October 24, and as we discussed in detail with your staff yesterday, the Treasury Department's normal quarterly refunding auctions are scheduled to be announced tomorrow, November 1. The auctions themselves are scheduled to be held during the week of November 6, and settlement is scheduled for November 15 and 16.

There may well be significant costs of disrupting our usual Treasury auction schedule. If there has been no increase in the debt limit by tomorrow morning, our announcement must put prospective bidders on notice that the auctions might have to be delayed or even cancelled. After such a contingent announcement, "when issued" trading in the securities to be auctioned cannot occur. Dealers may be less able to pre-market securities, and their risk of participation in the auction may thus be increased, raising the costs of the borrowing.

Should Congress fail to take action to raise the debt ceiling by November 6, we will be required once again to depart from our best financial management practices by canceling the scheduled auctions, and may be forced to take further steps to ensure that outstanding debt remains within the limit and that we have cash available to pay the Government's obligations.

As I have indicated in my previous letters, there are a limited number of actions we may be forced to take many of which have legal and practical implications. One such example would include Treasury's action to stop reinvesting the so-called G-Fund (the Federal Employees Retirement System's Government Securities Investment Fund). Securities held in the G-Fund mature and are reinvested on a daily basis, and the governing law provides for an automatic restoration of any lost interest when reinvestment resumes. Because of the inherent volatility of financing flows, such action may be required even prior to the week of November 6th. Furthermore, it will be necessary to call back Treasury cash balances held in our depository banks. This action will inconvenience those commercial banks with whom the Federal government does business.

Also, should Congress fail to act, Treasury may be forced to suspend the issuance of Savings Bonds—an action that would not only require us to send notices to the 80,000 issuing agents, but also would disrupt millions of Americans' use of a safe and convenient investment for their savings.

While these actions can provide some very limited relief, at the cost of creating significant dislocations and anxieties, it should be clearly understood that they will not be sufficient to substitute fully for the funding that we would ordinarily raise through the regular mid-November refinancings and that should be announced tomorrow. Stated another way, these temporary actions will not satisfy the continuing need for cash to fund the obligations and operations of the Government after November 14. Absent extraordinary steps, Congress must increase the debt limit in order to enable us to raise the funds necessary to pay obligations maturing November 15 and 16.

Finally, you should know that there are various other measures Treasury has been reviewing to avoid default should Congress not increase the debt limit by November 15, including actions involving the Civil Service Retirement Fund, but all such measures present uncertainties involving serious legal and practical issues and have significant costs and other adverse consequences.

Furthermore, the U.S. government's need for financing will not end on November 15 and 16. The financing calendar we distributed last week, and discussed in detail with your staff yesterday, showed four auctions in the last two weeks of November, and additional cash management bills may be needed. Successful completion of those auctions is critical to raising cash to make vital benefit payments on December 1 and during the week of December 4. As we have mentioned before, the months of October, November and the first half of December traditionally have very large seasonal cash deficits due to the absence of any large tax payment dates.

You and other members of the leadership have raised the prospect that Congress might enact a temporary debt limit increase, and we have expressed our total availability to work toward that end. Last Friday, at the President's direction, I proposed that the debt limit be increased by \$85 billion, to \$4.985 trillion. I would hope to discuss this proposal, and any other approaches you might have, at our meeting tomorrow.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. RUBIN.

APPENDIX—HISTORY OF TREASURY DEBT LIMIT PROJECTIONS AS OF OCTOBER 31

In a series of communications starting in July we informed the Congressional leadership of our projection that we would reach the debt limit in October. On October 17, we projected that unless we took some special actions, we would go over the limit on October 31. We then took these actions (reducing a bill auction and suspending sales of State and Local Government Series Securities) which enabled us to avoid that result. We also projected on October 17 that, as a consequence of those actions and assuming routine debt and cash management practices, we would reach the limit and exhaust our cash balance in the first few days of November. While daily forecasts vary, our projection today shows that both the debt limit capacity and cash balances remain within very thin margins of error during the week of November 6.

When Treasury staff, led by Under Secretary Hawke, met with your staff yesterday, we described our projections noted above and we also described how changes in government operations and budget decisions can alter these forecasts. For example, since October 24, the lack of legislative progress on certain appropriations bills has shifted some expenditures from late October to late November in our forecasts.

That shift has improved the forecasts only slightly. During the week of November 6, projected room under the debt limit varies but never exceeds \$2 billion, and, absent special actions, cash balances will be below our prudent minimum of \$5 billion on all but one day of that week. These forecasted thin margins of error show that it will be virtually impossible to have both sufficient debt capacity and cash balances to maintain Treasury's prudent financing and investment practices. I have been informed that the independent projections made by the Federal Reserve are consistent with Treasury's, and I know of no informed source that contradicts these projections. Let me caution again that daily forecasts vary.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1833, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-301) on the resolution (H. Res. 251) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2546, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-302) on the resolution (H. Res. 252) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2546) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION INTO IRS INVOLVEMENT IN "TRAVELGATE" IS WARRANTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, about a week and a half ago the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House held an investigative hearing into what is known as Travelgate and during that hearing, we went from the top to the bottom of the entire investigation. There were still some unanswered questions, so I would like to try to illuminate the issue for my colleagues and anybody else who may be paying attention.

Madam Speaker, when this administration took office, some people in the administration, including the First

Lady, felt like it was imperative that they do away with the people who were in the travel office that made travel arrangements for the press that followed the President around the country and put their people in.

In other words, they wanted to get rid of the people from the previous administration in charge of the travel office and replace them with people from their administration. The problem was that the people in the press liked the people who were already there. So, even though the administration had the ability to make this change, they chose not to do it because they did not want to make the press corps angry. At least that was the gist of what we heard.

So, Madam Speaker, they had some people start digging around to see if there were any improprieties in the travel office and so claim there was chicanery going on and then fire them. They even got the FBI to start investigating alleged violations or disbursements of small amounts of money in the travel office. Nevertheless, this started.

Once it started, it started becoming a quagmire for them. They tried to get the FBI involved and other agencies involved in something that really need not have taken place.

One of the things that happened was there was a contractor in Tennessee called Ultrair. Ultrair was a contractor for the White House and did some travel arrangements for press and other personnel that followed the President around the country when he went on his trips.

Ultrair, in October 1992, because they handled transactions like this, contacted the IRS on their own. They contacted the IRS to find out if excise taxes should have been withheld or charged for these travel arrangements. They did this voluntarily. Then about 5 or 6 months later, the day after the White House fired the travel office employees, it was reported in the newspapers, the Wall Street Journal and others, that there was some possible kickbacks involved and Ultrair was mentioned in a bad light, even though they had not done anything wrong. All they had asked for was a decision or review by the IRS on whether or not they should withhold excise taxes.

The next day after it appeared in the paper, a horde of IRS agents descended on their office and took control of their books and had them for 2 years. Some people believe this may have been an obstruction of justice, because at a cocktail party later on there was a conversation which was recorded and given to us at the committee meeting by John Podesta, the White House staff secretary, the principal author of the White House travel office management review.

At this cocktail party he put in his notes that, "BK said that PR was on

top of it." BK was Bill Kennedy, the assistant counsel to the President of the United States at the time, and PR was Peggy Richardson, who was the commissioner of the IRS.

BK said PR was on top of it. She said at the party the IRS is on top of it, and some references that the IRS agents are aware of something like that which would indicate that the head of the IRS, the commissioner for the IRS was working with the White House to keep control of these documents, which we believe may be an obstruction of justice.

When we had the hearing the other day, I asked the IRS people about this and they said they could not respond because of section 6103 of the Tax Code, which prohibits public disclosure of tax information about a specific taxpayer without the taxpayer's consent. The fact of the matter is we already had a release from the taxpayer for the IRS to give us that information and the IRS, nevertheless, would not give it to us. They said they would, if they saw the document and they would come and talk to our leadership at a closed meeting.

Madam Speaker, this smacks of obstruction of justice. It is something that should be investigated. The IRS is suspect by a lot of people in this country and when the head of the IRS starts saying that she is putting a lid on something and using the power of the IRS to constrict information that is vital to an investigation like Travelgate, it smacks of an obstruction of justice.

Madam Speaker, we need a full-fledged investigation of this. We need to have the IRS come before us in a closed hearing to explain why those documents were taken from Ultrair in Tennessee; why they were held for 2 years; why the FBI couldn't have access to them for the investigation, and why the head of the IRS said at a cocktail party she was keeping a lid on it.

VOLATILITY IN THE MEXICAN MARKET EQUALS UNITED STATES JOB LOSSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, last week, the Wall Street Journal finally got around to printing what we all already knew to be true—that none of the promises made by NAFTA's supporters have come true. The promised 200,000 high-skill, high-wage jobs have not materialized. Real wages in the United States have decreased by 3 percent, and in Mexico they have plummeted by over 50 percent. Even the Wall Street Journal now calls NAFTA "a terrible disappointment." It's about time. The Journal itself made an awful lot of promises in regard to NAFTA.

Yet NAFTA's supporters now incredibly claim that Mexico has "turned the corner"—but the financial markets tell us something different. Last week, the peso lost 7 percent of its value in one day, and hit a record low of 7.5 pesos to the dollar—a depreciation to less than half what the peso was worth before NAFTA. At the same time, interest rates jumped 9 percent. And the Mexican Bolsa—their stock market—has continued to plummet in value. This volatility is clearly due to a lack in confidence in Mexico's economy. So who should we believe: NAFTA's supporters, or the market? I'll take the market.

Why should Americans care about volatility in the Mexican market? Isn't it only the Wall Street fat cats and Mexican billionaires who play in that market? My friends, this volatility impacts each and every American as high-skill, high-wage United States jobs are continuing to be shipped to Mexico and our living standards continue to decline.

What is the connection? Think about the volatility in the Mexican market like this: it is like a garage sale for United States corporations. Because pesos cost only half of what they did before NAFTA, for United States corporations, everything in Mexico—including capital, taxes and labor costs—is half as expensive as it used to be. And that is not the end of the story.

□ 1845

United States corporations who operate in Mexico then export their goods from Mexico to the United States still charge us high prices for them. In short, it costs United States corporations half as much to manufacture their goods in Mexico so they are able to earn twice as much when they sell those same goods back here. It is no wonder that our corporations are moving production to Mexico at an accelerating rate.

NAFTA has become the deal of the century for them. In 1994, there were 2,000 maquiladora assembly plants along the border. At the end of this year there will be 2,600, an additional 30 percent. Just today, Lee jeans in St. Joseph, MO, announced it will terminate 479 workers, shutting production down there and moving those jobs to Mexico. Yesterday, Fruit of the Loom, an American staple company, said it will slash its U.S. work force, get ready, by 3,200 jobs to streamline operations here and boost profits, closing plants in Florence, AL, and Franklin, KY, Acadia Parish, LA, Batesville, MI and operations in Bowling Green, KY, Rockingham, NC, and the list goes on and on.

Where is the work going? You guessed it. Most of us know it is going south of our border to Mexican plants where Fruit of the Loom can pay Mexican workers less than \$1 a day. I guar-

antee you that the prices of their products will not come down in our country when they ship it back here.

As our colleague the gentleman from Ohio, JAMES TRAFICANT, said today, America is now losing its pants because of trade agreements like NAFTA. Funny, but sad.

We teach our nation's young people that, when they make mistakes, they should admit them and take responsibility for them, not deny them or try to cover them up.

But NAFTA's supporters are in a state of serious denial. Let us hear no more empty rhetoric about Mexico's economy having turned the corner before NAFTA can be fixed. Those who foisted it upon us have to own up to the fact that it is broken.

NAFTA's supporters need to acknowledge that Mexico's economy is fundamentally unsound and that the agreement is costing us jobs and holding down our wages, and it is destabilizing Mexico. They need to take responsibility for what they have done to the working families of our continent. That would be the first step in the right direction; that would be true leadership.

Let me say that growing NAFTA job losses translate into real people like the 14,000 tomato farmers in southern Florida, the more than 2,000 workers being scheduled to be laid off at Briggs & Stratton in the State of Wisconsin. I will include the entire list in the Record here this evening. It is time to wake up, go back to the bargaining table and strike an agreement that works for working people across this continent.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 26, 1995]
TWO YEARS LATER, THE PROMISES USED TO SELL NAFTA HAVEN'T COME TRUE, BUT ITS FOES WERE WRONG, TOO

(By Bob Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Promises, promises. Here's what was predicted two years ago for the North American Free Trade Agreement, followed by what really happened.

Prediction: "I believe the Nafta will create 200,000 American jobs in the first two years of its effect," President Clinton said, flanked by three of his predecessors in the Oval Office.

Reality: No evidence of any overall job gain as a result of trade with Mexico.

Prediction: Quaker Oats Co. said it would add 61 U.S. jobs in Dallas, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and St. Joseph, Mo., if Nafta passed, by shifting Gatorade, pancake mix and oatmeal production from Mexico.

Reality: Quaker Oats continues to make the stuff in Mexico. No new Nafta related jobs at the factories.

Prediction: "I believe that you have to just say that the peso would become stronger if Nafta passes," said Mr. Clinton, "because it would strengthen the Mexican economy."

Reality: He should leave futures trading to his wife.

VIEWES OF NAFTA FOES

Hardly anything anyone said about Nafta during the congressional fight, including

Nafta foes, has turned out to be true. That's a problem for all the big players in Nafta, particularly President Clinton. Meantime, many Nafta foes consider the trade pact a symbol of fat cat Washington, where promises aren't kept and the little guy always loses. For them, says Nafta-opponent Pat Choate: "Nafta was their first real issue. They lost by a hair. They feel the vote was stolen by the president. And it's turned out worse, than they expected."

Of course, Nafta's ultimate impact won't be known for years. But measured by promises used to sell it, Nafta is a colossal disappointment. Jobs haven't materialized, border-area congestion has worsened, and environmental cleanup remains haphazard. But Ross Perot had it wrong, too. He warned that Nafta would put six million U.S. factory jobs "at risk." Instead, U.S. manufacturers have added about 300,000 jobs since he made the prediction. Nafta probably limited the length of the Mexican recession by boosting exports to the U.S., while also helping some chronically depressed border towns.

At its core, Nafta is a pact to eliminate tariffs among the U.S., Canada and Mexico over 15 years, and protect investments in all three countries. Judging strictly by these criteria, it works. Two-way trade between the U.S. and Mexico—Canada already had its own free-trade pact with the U.S.—has grown 30% since 1993.

But Nafta's significance was always greater than trade statistics; it was a new model for economic development. A big industrialized nation would merge economically with an impoverished neighbor, without paying billions of dollars in aid as the European Union did when pulling in poorer relations. Liberalized trade and investment would make Mexico wealthier, the White House said, opening markets and creating jobs. Results were promised—fast.

Improvements should be most obvious at the border, where trade's impact is the strongest. Lured by cheap wages and tariff breaks, U.S. companies have run factories on the Mexican side for 30 years—and aggravated health hazards as factories and a burgeoning population poured refuse into canals on the Mexican side. By cutting tariffs throughout Mexico, the White House argued, development would extend inland, while environmental funds would clean up the border.

What really happened?

So-called maquiladora border factories—which import auto parts and electronics, process them and send them north again—have boomed. Foreign investment in the interior has withered. In the nearly two years since Nafta took effect on Jan. 1, 1994, maquiladora employment rose 20% to 648,000, according to the Mexican forecasting arm of WEFA Group Inc. By the year 2000, it will reach 943,000, the consulting firm predicts.

Maria Luna takes home \$31 a week assembling seatbelts at a TRW Inc. factory in Reynosa, Mexico, a few miles south of Brownsville, Texas. How has her life changed since Nafta? A niece from Veracruz recently joined her to seek work and crowd into Ms. Luna's garage-sized shack with 10 others. "People still come," she says. "They though they'd stay here a little time, but they stay."

The border boom results largely from Mexico's peso devaluation, which cut overall labor costs, including benefits, to \$1.80 an hour from \$2.54. Human factors contribute, too. U.S. managers can live in comfortable homes in Brownsville and El Paso in Texas or in San Diego, sending their children to

American schools and commuting across the border to work. That can't be duplicated in Mexico's interior, whose lousy roads and telephone lines also scare off U.S. companies.

One expanding shantytown is Colonia Salinas de Gortari, named for the former Mexican president, on the outskirts of Reynosa. Workers there so they can't afford city rents anymore, so they seize land and build plywood shacks the size of tool sheds, with no running water, no sewage, no electricity, no paved streets. Maria Del Carmen Garcia Luna, who isn't related to Ms. Luna, lives in one of the shacks with her toddler and husband, a Zenith maintenance worker.

NOT ENOUGH MONEY FOR CHILDREN

In the U.S., jobs like her husband's are the backbone of countless blue-collar neighborhoods. But he takes home only \$26 a week, and merely buying powdered milk for the child consumers 15% of it. "We don't have enough money for meat or chicken," she says.

About the best Nafta has done so far is to limit the impact of the Mexican crisis on the U.S., while offering Mexico a chance to export its way out of trouble. During the last crisis in 1982, U.S. border communities were crippled as Mexico sharply raised tariffs and restricted imports. This time, Mexico kept tariffs at Nafta-reduced levels and pushed exports.

In Brownsville, retailers complain that few Mexicans can afford to shop there for clothes and electronics anymore. But Brownsville's port, which serves the industrial hub of Monterrey, is booming. Cranes load five-foot-high coils of steel into the black-hulled "Sunny Success," bound for Italy. Port managers lobby for a new bridge to ease border transport. Local unemployment remains distressingly high, around 11%, but it hasn't surged, as in 1982.

However, Nafta has failed to deliver on the biggest White House promise: creating U.S. jobs.

During the Nafta debate, Fortune 500 companies forecast job gains, which now look foolishly naive. Johnson & Johnson says it can't locate the person who in 1993 forecast "800 more U.S. positions" as a result of Nafta. "If there is job growth, I don't think that's because of Nafta," says a spokesman.

Some big-time exporters do report gains. General Electric Co. says sales of power equipment and locomotives are up, as Mexico upgrades its infrastructure. But the company notes carefully that this work "isn't creating jobs, it's supporting jobs." In other words, Nafta makes it less likely that GE will have to lay off workers.

SPECIAL NAFTA MATH

U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor gamely argues that Nafta "created a huge number of net jobs." But he needs special Nafta math to do so. He counts just export growth—not jobs lost through imports—and adds in Canada. Mr. Clinton only cited trade with Mexico in his job-growth prediction, and for good reason. Canada's free-trade agreement with the U.S. dates to 1989; Nafta barely affected their trade relations.

Gary Hufbauer, an economist at the Institute for International Economics whose predictions of Nafta job gains were embraced by the Clinton and Bush White Houses, now figures the surging trade deficit with Mexico has cost the U.S. 225,000 jobs. But such estimates are suspect, too. With the U.S. economy near what's considered to be full employment, it's difficult to know how many workers actually lost jobs as a result of

Nafta and whether they found new ones quickly. The Labor Department has certified only 21,500 workers for special unemployment benefits because they lost their jobs as a result of trade with Mexico.

The Clinton administration pins much blame for missed promises on the peso's collapse last December, when Mexico ran out of dollars to support it. The country had become to dependent on short-term borrowing to finance imports and didn't recognize enough that it had to devalue.

Some economists say Nafta helped cause delay. It let Mexico see itself as part of the industrial elite, a self-image reinforced when it joined the rich-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In August 1994, an internal U.S. Treasury analysis found the peso overvalued by 10%, but noted Mexico didn't agree because it expected a Nafta surge.

Optimists contend the Mexican economy will start growing soon. Yet the peso mess and ensuing recession have pushed the benefits far into the future. "If people notice anything with Nafta, they notice more traffic because there's more trade," says Alfredo Phillips, who runs a border development bank. "Expected improvements haven't occurred." He then adds a new prediction: "We expect we'll see them next year."

MORE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS ARMS TO PAKISTAN PROVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to talk a bit about the conference report on the foreign operations appropriations bill which was passed just in the last hour or so. As I mentioned on the floor, it is sort of a mixed bag. I supported the bill because I think overall it is a good bill. But there are some good and bad items in it.

I want to talk about one good aspect and one bad aspect, if I could in the time that I have allotted this evening.

First of all, I was very pleased to see that the conferees actually reduced the amount of economic assistance to Turkey. Last year Turkey received \$45 million in United States economic support. This year it will be down to \$33.5 million, significantly less than the \$100 million that was requested by the administration. I think in large part that is due to the efforts of Congressman JOHN PORTER from Illinois and the amendment that he had successfully adopted on the House floor back in June, which was supported by myself and others.

That amendment basically pointed out that Turkey has been involved in a number of issues that are detrimental both to the United States and to a lot of other ethnic groups as well as other countries in its vicinity.

First of all, the reduction in aid, I believe, clearly recognizes the unlawful blockade by Turkey of Armenia. It also recognizes the treatment that Turkey

has been giving to the Kurds, an ethnic minority within its borders and even beyond its borders. Turkey has been systematically annihilating Kurds, tearing down, burning villages. In the conference report specific reference is made to one of my constituents, a U.S. citizen by the name of Aliza Marcus, who is a Reuters journalist and a New Jersey resident who is being tried in Turkey on charges of provoking racial hatred for reporting on the Turkish military's forced evacuation and destruction of villages in southeastern Turkey. The conferees say they expect that the Government of Turkey will protect freedom of expression and information by interceding with the military-sponsored state security courts on behalf of Aliza Marcus. This woman has done nothing more than do her job and now she is being tried in Turkish courts.

In addition to that, I believe the reduction in aid to Turkey recognizes that Turkish intransigence on the Cyprus issue. I believe very strongly that Cyprus should be reunited, that the Turkish military should pull out and, in fact, the conference report specifically earmarks \$15 million for Cyprus among other things aimed at reunification of that island. So I believe that our efforts on behalf of both Armenia, the Kurds and the Cypriots to point out that Turkey really is no ally of the United States is clearly reflected in the conference report.

I am concerned, though, and I did want to express my concern, that the conference report does include the Senate language which permit the transfer of seized military equipment to the Government of Pakistan. This provision was not part of the House-passed bill, and I regret that this ill-advised and dangerous provision is in the conference report. During the conference I was joined by 40 of my House colleagues from both sides of the aisle in writing to the conferees urging that they not recede to the Senate provision with regard to the arms sales to Pakistan.

As we noted in our letter to the conferees, during the last decade Pakistan was the third largest recipient of United States military assistance. Pakistan asked for the help of the United States in becoming conventionally strong militarily and, in exchange, promised not to develop nuclear weapons. But by 1985, United States intelligence had strong evidence that Pakistan was taking United States arms while going back on its word about developing nuclear capability.

In response to Pakistan's confirmed assurances in 1985, the Congress enacted the Pressler amendment to allow Pakistan to continue to receive United States assistance so long as the President could annually certify that Pakistan does not have a nuclear device. But in 1985, after passage of the Pres-

ler amendment, Pakistan contracted for the delivery of 68 F-16 fighters and other military equipment totaling \$2.6 billion.

In 1990, Pakistan had received 40 of the 68 planes and a considerable amount of other equipment had been delivered when President Bush was forced by overwhelming evidence to find that Pakistan had the bomb. The Pressler amendment was invoked ending all military assistance, including weapons contracted and paid for.

Unfortunately, this provision, which is in the conference report, would essentially take away the strong force of the Pressler amendment and allow significant amount of these arms sales to take place and be transferred to Pakistan. I think that that is unfortunate. It violates the Pressler amendment, and it contributes extensively to more instability in Southeast Asia.

Overall though the conference report is a good report and that is why I supported it.

AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE BEING MISLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, this House voted last week and the week before for a huge increase in spending on Medicare.

I repeat—we voted for and passed legislation providing for a huge increase in Medicare.

In fact, federal spending overall will go up by many billions every year under the budgets passed by both the House and the Senate. James K. Glasman, the Washington Post columnist, referred to it as the "no-cut budget." These budgets simply attempt to slow the growth in federal spending to about 3 percent a year.

When you are spending in the range of \$1.6 trillion to more than \$2 trillion during the 7 years of this plan, a 3 percent increase is \$50 to \$60 billion a year.

That is billion with a B—and even one billion dollars is a lot of money—and these budgets—the Republican budgets—will increase Federal spending \$50 to \$60 billion every year.

We voted for a huge increase in spending on Medicare—about 7½ percent a year—more than twice the rate of inflation.

Yet all we hear about are cuts—cuts—cuts.

We are told that these mega-billion dollar increases are draconian cuts.

Why—well the main reason is that the Federal bureaucrats who got 15 to 20 percent increases routinely for so many years really feel that 2 or 3 percent increases are cuts.

The first Reagan budget—fiscal 1982—was \$581 billion. We almost triple that

figure now—an almost 300 percent increase in just 15 years.

I don't think anyone believes that we can sit back and let Federal spending keep exploding like it has without having a major economic crash a few years down the road.

Yet the American people are being misled when they are being told about all these so called cuts. A very false impression is being created.

In fact, I have been in and around politics since I was a small boy, and I do not believe I have ever seen the lies, the distortions, the propaganda, that we have now.

Let me give just a couple of examples. Bruce Babbitt, the Secretary of the Interior, has become the most blatantly political Secretary in the history of the Department.

He has been going all over the country attacking Republicans even at one time using extremist rhetoric comparing us to the Japanese and their sneak attack at Pearl Harbor.

He came to my area of east Tennessee and said Republicans were gutting the national parks, and he has been quoted as saying that there is some sort of Republican hit list to close as many as 200 parks.

What are the facts. Well, last week, National Park Service Director Roger Kennedy admitted under oath that he knew of no such list and no plan to close any parks.

Because of Secretary Babbitt, and because of an incomplete job by reporters, people in my area think the Great Smoky Mountains have been cut.

Well, the truth is that spending on the Great Smokies has gone up from \$6.5 to \$10.3 million in the last 10 years—and increases of 64 percent, about twice the rate of inflation over that period.

Another increase, a little over 2 percent is scheduled for this fiscal year. Now I wish we could get more, but the point is that there have been no cuts, and in fact, national park spending has gone way up over the past 10 or 15 years.

Another example—and there are hundreds—former Speaker Foley said on the PBS national news Friday night that Republicans had cut the earned income tax credit. Once again—not so.

The earned income tax credit cost this country \$1.3 billion in 1975; \$2.5 billion in 1985. Then it began exploding. We are now spending \$23 billion each year on this program, and it goes to over \$27 billion under the Republican budget—once again—no cut, and in fact a several billion dollar increase. Another example—spending on student loans go up from \$24 to \$36 billion—yet some are calling this a cut.

Most of this outcry about cuts is coming from bureaucrats or fat cat Federal contractors who are having to justify their spending or show the results for the first time in many years—if ever.

And it turns out that most of this spending is doing little good for the intended beneficiaries and instead is really benefiting only bureaucrats or government contractors.

One example, and once again—there are hundreds—the Job Corps Program—again a program that is not—repeat—not being cut.

Counting all costs, we are now spending \$25,000 per year per Job Corps student. If we told one of these students that we were spending this much on them, they would be shocked.

Fifty percent drop out in the first 6 months. Seven months is the average stay. Only 12 percent end up in jobs for which they were trained.

We could give each of these students a \$1,000-a-month allowance, send them to an expensive private school and still save money. They would probably think they had died and gone to heaven.

Who really benefits from this billion plus program—once again the bureaucrats and few politically connected Federal contractors.

There are two points here Madam Speaker. One is Federal spending is not being cut, and for one specific program—Medicare—we have voted to give it huge increases.

The second point, when you hear about cuts, ask two questions. Who is screaming about the cuts—it is almost always some bureaucrat who is working for the program or some contractor who is making money off of it.

The second question—ask them specifically how much they got under the first Reagan budget 15 years ago and how much will they get during this fiscal year. With very few exceptions, you will find that almost every Federal department, agency, or program has received huge increases since that time.

Ask questions—don't be deceived.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight, the last day of Breast Cancer Awareness Month, to ensure that our attention to the elimination of breast cancer will continue, because one month of awareness is not enough, when over 47,000 women will die this year from breast cancer.

Our messages this evening are now without hope. In the last few years we have made substantial progress on breast cancer research, diagnosis and treatment. The gains regarding breast cancer are considerable. In this year's budget alone, well over \$400 million is dedicated to breast cancer research.

□ 1900

Mammograms have decreased the death rate from breast cancer for

women over 50 by 30 percent. Unfortunately the losses relating to breast cancer continue to rise and compel us to continue our battle.

In 1983, Madam Speaker, the odds of a woman developing breast cancer were 1 in 10. Today they are 1 in 8. This year there will be 182,000 new cases diagnosed. In New York City alone approximately 8,500 cases of breast cancer will be reported this year, and in the decade of the 1990's, Madam Speaker, estimates say that 1.5 million cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed and nearly 500,000 women will die of this disease.

Unfortunately an amendment to the Medicare legislation that would have expanded Medicare to fully cover annual mammograms for Medicare beneficiaries over the age of 49 failed. This denial of services is yet another reason the President must veto the Reconciliation Act and negotiate to have this AMA-approved coverage put back in. Obviously in the interest of all women's lives we need to cut our losses and increase our gains in breast cancer screening, prevention, and treatment. We must work together to eradicate breast cancer, not just raise awareness. To reach that goal we need to fight to insure increased research into the cause of and treatments for breast cancer, improved access for all women to high-quality screening diagnoses, and treatment and inclusion of the wisdom and courage of breast cancer survivors, and the influencing of research clinical trials and national policy.

For the approximately 2,750 New York City women who will die this year from breast cancer and the thousand who will be diagnosed, I call on my colleagues to join me in a call to action on breast cancer awareness. Say it, fight it, cure it, fund it.

Madam Speaker, I would like to add into the RECORD two statements from colleagues of mine from the great State of New York who could not be here tonight but who would like their remarks in the record, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FRISA].

Mr. KING. Madam Speaker, as you know, October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. That is why I am pleased to be joining many of my colleagues this evening to participate in a Special Order on raising breast cancer awareness.

While breast cancer is a serious problem in communities all across the country, it has enacted a particularly terrible toll in my home area of Long Island. Between 1984 and 1988, the breast cancer mortality rate for one group of women in Nassau County was 16 percent higher than that of New York State and 36 percent higher than that of the Nation. There is scarcely a family on Long Island that has not been affected by this dreaded disease.

These alarming statistics prompted Congressional action in 1993. Working closely with other concerned Members of Congress, the Long Island delegation was successful in se-

curing authorization for the Long Island Breast Cancer Study Project. Under the auspices of the National Cancer Institute, several of New York's finest research institutions are actively investigating the impact that the environment may have on Long Island's high rate of breast cancer. I am very pleased that this landmark Study is now underway.

Earlier this year, I was approached by fellow Long Islander Diane Sackett Nannery who informed me of her crusade to win approval of a special Pink Ribbon Breast Cancer Awareness Stamp. I immediately enlisted the support of 101 of our colleagues in sending a letter to Postmaster General Marvin Runyon urging approval of the breast cancer stamp. As a result of our efforts and the tireless determination of Diane Nannery, the Postal Service has announced that it will issue a breast cancer awareness stamp in 1996.

A major goal of raising awareness about breast cancer is to encourage women to get screening mammographies. This procedure is simple, safe and the best tool available for detecting a potential problem. The National Cancer Institute recently initiated a new service designed to provide information about FDA-approved mammography facilities. By dialing 1-800-422-6237 women will receive information on the facility nearest them. Through this service, I was able to obtain information on the 59 facilities located in Nassau County.

At a time when many Federal programs are being reduced or eliminated, the new Republican leadership has identified breast cancer research funding as a top priority. Included in the fiscal year 1996 Labor, Health and Human Services and Related Agencies Appropriations bill (H.R. 2127), is a 4-percent increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health. These additional resources will result in more money for breast cancer research at the National Cancer Institute. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this critical funding receives final approval from Congress in the days ahead.

We have only just begun to fight the scourge of breast cancer. I am committed to doing all that I can to fund research, increase awareness, and make mammography screening available and accessible to women all across the country. The battle against this disease will continue to be a top priority.

Mr. FRISA. Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity during Breast Cancer Awareness month to thank my colleague from New York, Representative MALONEY, for organizing this important tribute to women across the country who have battled this dreadful disease.

Unfortunately, my home of Long Island has the distinction of having one of the highest rates of breast cancer in the Nation. Nationally, this disease takes the lives of 46,000 women. Each year, my home, Nassau County, loses about 300 women a year to this deadly disease.

While great strides have been made in recent years toward understanding the causes of breast cancer, and finding better ways to treat this disease, much work still needs to be done.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the efforts of Dr. Marlie Gammon and her team, who are working tirelessly on the Long

Island Breast Cancer Study Project. They have recently announced plans for a comprehensive study into environmental causes of breast cancer.

Her team will be going into the homes of every woman on Long Island who is diagnosed with breast cancer to take water, soil, and dust samples in determining if there is a common link.

I know the toll this disease takes on the women of Long Island and their families. My mother was diagnosed with this disease, and is winning her battle against it. But too many women are losing this battle every day.

We need to support these women, and the friends and family who stand behind them as they battle breast cancer. While it is important that we set aside October for Breast Cancer Awareness Month, the efforts of these women must be recognized every day.

Madam Speaker, it is my sincere hope that in the near future we will have a special order, not to honor the survivors and remember the victims, but to celebrate the discovery of a cure for this devastating disease.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I am honored to be able to talk on this subject with my colleagues.

October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

First of all, let's look at the numbers: By the end of this year, an estimated 17,600 California women will be diagnosed.

Four thousand four hundred California women will die.

Breast cancer is an epidemic against our wives, daughters, sisters, and mothers.

During the 1970's and 80's the incidence increased in older women by 49 percent.

Virtually all women are at risk for developing breast cancer during their lives.

But October is not Breast Cancer Awareness Month to let everyone know how many women will die, it is awareness on how to survive.

How can we protect ourselves and the ones that we love?

Through two steps:

(1) Early detection, and

(2) Increased funding for medical research.

Early detection can be achieved through screening with mammography and clinical breast examinations.

That means making mammography available to all women regardless of cost.

The recent cuts in Medicare and Medicaid will definitely have a terrible effect on poorer older women who are in desperate need for these tests.

Increased funding is also needed.

In 1993, the Department of Defense received an appropriation of \$210 million for breast cancer research.

The National Institutes of Health plans to spend \$426 million for breast cancer research. In 1995, the funding was completely zeroed out.

These amounts are not sufficient, and I will tell you why . . .

No major treatment has been introduced.

No proven prevention methods have emerged.

The mortality rate has remained constant.

We must work together to promote early detection and to achieve increased research funding in our fight against breast cancer.

Let's extend awareness beyond October.

We owe it to the women we love.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Breast Cancer Awareness Month. We have all heard the startling figures surrounding breast cancer; 2.6 million women are living with this terrible disease today. Breast cancer will strike 1 in 8 women during their lifetimes. An estimated 183,000 new cases will be diagnosed this year.

While we are making gains against this terrible killer, much remains to be done. Breast cancer is still the most common form of cancer among women in the United States; yet its cause is unknown and its cure remains undetermined. Today, our strongest tools in the battle against this disease are increased awareness and continued research.

Continued funding to expand research is crucial. Projects such as the Long Island Breast Cancer Study Project [LIBCSP] are essential. The LIBCSP, in cooperation with the National Cancer Institute, examines possible links between breast cancer and environmental and occupational factors on Long Island, NY, where instances of breast cancer are unusually high. My colleagues in the New York delegation and I worked hard to support this project that may someday help control the factors that lead to this disease, not only in New York, but across the country.

Early detection and treatment are the most effective methods of combatting breast cancer and increasing a woman's chances of survival. Despite these facts, many women do not know how to detect the early warning signs, or to perform a routine self-exam. Too many women living with the disease are not aware of the treatment options available to them. Breast Cancer Awareness Month offers a special opportunity to focus public attention on various treatment options, and offer more women information that is vital to their well being.

This week, the Caucus for Women's Issues will be sending a strong signal to the administration on the importance of increased awareness. I have agreed to join my colleagues in signing a letter to Health and Human Services Secretary Shalala, which calls for a "blueprint for action" to provide women with information on treatment options. The information campaign that we are recommending would serve to reduce the dramatic disconnect between the type of treatment women say they prefer and that which they currently receive. It is time to get the message out that there are viable alternatives to the mastectomy procedure.

Through information we can help women learn to detect breast cancer in its early and most treatable stages. Through information we can enlighten those who have already been diagnosed as to their options. Through research we move closer both to understanding the causes of breast cancer and to finding a cure. Breast Cancer Awareness Month is a step in this direction, but as this month draws to a close I would like to encourage continued focus throughout our Nation on breast cancer and its treatment.

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Breast Cancer Awareness Month. It is a month dedicated to increasing American's awareness of the importance of early detection and diagnosis in the fight against

breast cancer. Mr. Speaker, according to the National Cancer Institute Nassau and Suffolk Counties rank first and fourth, respectively, in breast cancer mortality rates among the 116 largest counties in the United States. This staggering statistic cannot be ignored. Too many of our mothers, daughters, and sisters have been afflicted with this destructive disease and it is important that we educate women on the importance of self-checks and mammograms in order to combat the high incidence of breast cancer.

Long Island has some of the highest rates of breast cancer in the Nation and a high death rate among women diagnosed with breast cancer in Nassau and Suffolk County. The Long Island Breast Cancer Study Project will look at exposures to contaminated drinking water, sources of air pollution, electromagnetic fields, pesticides and other toxic chemicals, and hazardous and municipal waste. Research is a valuable instrument in trying to understand this devastating disease.

Mr. Speaker, over this past year I have had the honor of working with Diane Nannery, a resident of Manorville and breast cancer survivor, on increasing breast cancer awareness across the country. Working together with thousands of concerned women in Suffolk County, we were successful in getting a breast cancer awareness stamp to be created by the United States Postal Service for 1996. The breast cancer awareness stamp will serve as a constant reminder to all Americans of the urgency for awareness of this terrible disease. Every time a book of stamps is purchased at the post office, people will be reminded of the urgency for early detection of breast cancer in order to save millions of women's lives. The stamp will be printed sometime next summer.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996, approximately 184,300 new cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed and 44,300 women will die from this disease. Breast Cancer Awareness Month is dedicated to those who have survived breast cancer and those who have not. It is a time to make America aware of breakthroughs in breast cancer treatment, research, and testing. I am honored to have spoken before this body on the importance of awareness in battling breast cancer, and my heart goes out to those families who have lost a loved one to this destructive disease.

Mr. STOKES. Madam Speaker, I rise in observance of National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. In recognition of this occasion, I ask my colleagues to take time out to assess the impact that this devastating disease has had on their constituents, colleagues, families, and friends—for no one is immune to this life threatening disease.

According to the American Cancer Society, over 180,000 new cases are diagnosed each year, approximately 1 every 3 minutes. One person will be diagnosed with breast cancer just during the time span of my statement. Even more devastating, 44,000 women and 300 men are expected to die from the disease. Among women, breast cancer is the most common cancer.

While breast cancer mortality rates have declined 5.5 percent from 1989 to 1992, due to advances in therapy and screening programs, this decline was only seen among whites. Breast cancer deaths for African-American females increased 2.6 percent. We must find the

cure for and cause of the mortality differential for this devastating disease. Equally important, we must ensure that all Americans benefit from advances in breast cancer biomedical research, treatment, diagnosis, early detection, and prevention. Early detection is key to increasing the chance of cure and the benefits from more effective treatment options for the disease.

Madam Speaker, while our and our colleagues' families continue to have access to life saving screening, treatment, and prevention health care services for breast cancer, just a few days ago, here in this House, our Republican colleagues celebrated the passage of their legislation to strip those same critical life saving health care services away from millions of families by dismantling Medicaid and Medicare. That unconscionable act will have a negative impact on the progress the Nation has begun to make in ensuring that all women receive early diagnosis, screening, and appropriate treatment for breast cancer.

My heart goes out to the Nation's health care organizations and the hundreds of thousands of volunteers who have worked long and hard to achieve that progress. I applaud their steadfast leadership and commitment to expediting the search for a cure. I ask that they lend their support to me and my colleagues who are working to overturn the Republican assault on the health of the American people. It is just inhumane to force families to see their loved ones go without the critical health care services that they so desperately need.

Madam Speaker, all women must have access to the life saving screening and treatment they need to conquer breast cancer.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on an issue that is of deep concern to all Americans. Breast cancer is a dreaded and devastating disease which has reached epidemic proportions. Currently, there are 2.6 million women living with breast cancer in the United States. In 1995 alone, an estimated 182,000 new cases will be diagnosed and over 46,000 women will die of this disease.

In the past 5 years, breast cancer research has received strong congressional support. As I noted earlier this year, I am proud, as chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus Task Force on Women's Health, that we have increased research funding by 65 percent. We have begun to make important progress including the discovery of a breast cancer gene, the declining mortality rates for some segments of the population and Medicare coverage of mammograms for early detection.

Despite the progress we have made in the past 5 years, our work is not done. There is still no cure for breast cancer, there is no way to prevent it, and the treatments available continue to be invasive and damaging to the women undergoing them.

It is therefore of utmost importance that we reaffirm our commitment to further breast cancer research. Too many women still suffer and die and too many families are left struggling with their loss.

Today, on the final day of Breast Cancer Awareness Month, we remember all the women, men and children whose lives have been touched by breast cancer. This year, I

have lost two young friends to this disease and while their loss can never be compensated, I can and do pledge to work to ensure the Federal commitment remains strong and that we continue to devote all possible resources to winning the battle against this disease.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED BEFORE WE COMMIT TROOPS TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRYCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I am taking time tonight, along with some of my colleagues, to talk about what I fear could become one of the most serious foreign policy blunders in memory.

Yesterday this House sent a resounding message to President Clinton. The message was simple: Do not send American ground troops to Bosnia without the approval of Congress. And I want to point out to those critics in the administration that this was a bipartisan message. Three hundred fifteen Members, including half of the President's own party in this body, voted in favor of this sense-of-the-House resolution.

Yesterday's vote was a first step, and I want to emphasize first step, in this matter, and now I am confident that this House will take even stronger action in the coming days. Our colleagues, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], have introduced a binding legislative bill that will require the Clinton administration to seek the authorization of Congress before deploying any ground troops into Bosnia. We are not talking politics here, as much as the President would like to make this a partisan issue. We are talking about Congress' plenary control of the power of the purse and its moral obligation to address this fundamental policy issue. I fully expect this House to exercise its constitutional authority in the very near future.

Madam Speaker, many of us in the Congress have a number of very serious questions we would like the Clinton administration to answer, and to date those answers have been few and far between. For instance, what kind of risk to our troops are we talking about? What is this operation going to cost in terms of American lives? Almost certainly there will be casualties in that treacherous and mountainous region of the world.

I explicitly asked the Vice President for the administration's casualty estimates weeks ago, but I have not yet received an answer, not one word, from the administration on this matter. What is it going to cost in terms of taxpayer dollars? And where is the money going to come from? What are the rules of engagement? What happens

the first time a stray bullet hits an American peacekeeper? What is the exit strategy?

Madam Speaker, Secretaries Christopher and Perry insist that troops will be home in a year. Few believe that, but, if so, then what? An outbreak of lasting peace in the Balkans? If you believe that, I have got a bridge I would like to sell to you.

These are critical questions, and the answers, are not forthcoming from the White House.

Now I would submit that there is a reason that those answers have not been forthcoming. The reason is that there is no clear mission. President Clinton mistakenly, and apparently without consulting anybody in Congress, promised to send American ground troops to Bosnia in the event of a peace agreement. If he had bothered to ask, somebody would have told him that the last three peace agreements in Bosnia have been dismal failures and that the presence of American troops in that troubled region would likely do little to improve the attitudes of the warring parties.

Does President Clinton have the support of the American people in this instance? Absolutely not. I have received numerous calls and letters in my particular district in Cincinnati from people who have urged me to prevent United States troops from going in on the ground in Bosnia. I am still waiting for one call or one letter from anybody who thinks it is a good idea to send young Americans into Bosnia on the ground.

One of the major newspapers in my district, the Cincinnati Enquirer, published an editorial last week which I think sums up the views of most of my constituents and the constituents of many other Members in this body, and I would like to insert that in the RECORD at this point. This is a copy of the article:

[The Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 24, 1995]

NO WAY—SENDING U.S. TROOPS TO BOSNIA WOULD BE A DISASTROUS BLUNDER

It may throw a wet blanket on the United Nations' 50th birthday party, but someone besides Russian President Boris Yeltsin should ask some tough questions about the U.N. debacle in Bosnia.

Start by asking President Clinton: How can a contortionist who twisted himself into ethical pretzels to avoid Vietnam, send 20,000 U.S. troops marching into quicksand in Bosnia?

The echoes of Vietnam are unmistakable: Another war in which unsupported troops fight for unexplained goals in an ungrateful land. For all his recent rhetoric about rescuing NATO and performing a "peacekeeping" role, Clinton still has not offered a reason why one American life—much less 20,000—should be risked for a shameful paper "peace" that ratifies the rape and plunder of Bosnia.

The fragile truce now in effect (between attacks) exists only because the Bosnian Serbs dread Croatian attacks more than air strikes or U.N. scolding. Bloodthirsty Bosnian Serbs

who bombarded unarmed cities are fleeing from the Croatian army.

So now they suddenly want to talk peace. If a real peace agreement can be worked out in talks that begin Oct. 31 at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio, there will be plenty of soldiers on all sides to enforce it.

Sending U.S. troops into a flammable pit of ethnic hatred, where death has been a fact of life since 1992, will invite hostage taking and terrorism against our soldiers, to inflame American outrage against Clinton's policy. Somalia and the near-loss of a U.S. flier in Bosnia should be a fresh, painful reminder that it is sheer folly to gamble American blood in a game where our nation has no cards to play.

If that's not enough Clinton can recall his own protests against Vietnam.

Instead, he threatens to invoke his presidential war powers to send troops, even if Congress balks.

Clinton's crew is already squishy, backing down on promises that U.S. troops would be out in one year. Former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney told CBS, "To talk about a timetable that we will be out within a year, when we don't know what the objective is, and haven't really developed a plan for executing that, raises serious questions about the quality of the decision making process within the administration."

After leaving Bosnia policy on U.N. cruise control until it ran into a ditch, Clinton now wants to floorboard U.S. intervention. If he does, it will take more than a wrecker to pull us out.

Madam Speaker, I want to stress again this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue where first and foremost we are talking about American lives, young men and young women who may be sent to die in a foreign land. We all remember the tragedy in Lebanon. Who can forget the image of those flag-draped caskets coming home from a peacekeeping mission in a land where there was no peace? And we remember the more recent tragedies when this Government sent more of its young people on a loosely defined mission to Somalia. The image of that young American soldier's body being dragged through the streets is forever etched in our memories.

Madam Speaker, let us not commit our young soldiers to another so-called peacekeeping mission which is doomed to failure. Let us put a stop to this ill-advised Bosnian plan before it is too late.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAULO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAULO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to participate in this special order, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for her efforts in organizing this commemoration of Breast Cancer Awareness month. Most importantly, we are here to pay tribute to the women and men who fight to survive this deadly and tragic disease.

Breast cancer claims the lives of more than 44,000 women and 300 men each year. Excluding cancers of the skin, breast cancer is the most common cancer among women, accounting for one out of every three cancer diagnoses.

In 1996, over 184,000 new cases of invasive breast cancer are expected to be diagnosed.

While the statistics are daunting, there is hope.

We have learned over the years that early diagnosis and early treatment of breast cancer dramatically increases survival rates for its victims.

I know something about the importance of early detection—it saved my life.

Nine years ago, I was diagnosed with ovarian cancer. But I was lucky. My cancer was discovered early and I have been cancer free for 9 years. I am forever grateful to the wonderful doctors and nurses who saved my life and to the many researchers whose relentless and often unrecognized efforts have produced so many advancements in cancer detection and treatment.

We know that early detection is the most effective way to keep cancer from killing. Unfortunately, these services are not as readily and widely available as they need to be.

Therefore, we must continue to fight for increased funding for breast cancer research and screening. As a member of the National Security Committee, I worked hard to ensure that the House appropriated \$100 million for breast cancer programs in the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

Furthermore, we must fight for increased funding for the breast cancer research at the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute. The House appropriated a 5.7-percent increase in funding for the National Cancer Institute, which funds the Breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Prevention programs which I sponsored.

On the last evening of Breast Cancer Awareness month, we must not allow the specter of breast cancer to lurk in the darkness. We must recommit ourselves in the upcoming year to arm our Nation's women with the information, resources and support to combat and survive this horrifying disease. Together, I know we can do it.

REASONS FOR SENDING TROOPS INTO BOSNIA NEED TO BE EXAMINED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly applaud the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAULO] in her comments, and her fight against cancer

and her fight against cancer in this institution as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues to ask the President to go to the American people and tell us why we must send troops to Bosnia. It is a simple request, but it is one that must be made, and it is one that we must have the President address to the American people. I would submit, from the calls and comments that I received from the folks that I represent in Kansas, that he has not made his case to the American people. He has not make his case to the Congress. I sit on the Committee on International Relations, and we have heard from several of the Secretaries in this administration, and they fail to put forward a clear plan, a clear reason, a convincing case, a compelling case, for why we should send our young men and women into Bosnia.

Now it seems to me that we have discovered the way to handle these sorts of issues some time ago, and particularly this was exercised during the Persian Gulf war when that President, President Bush, initially said, well, Congress, I need a vote of the Congress, but then there was so much pressure he decided, no, I will get a vote of the Congress, and he took his case to the American people, and he explained why we needed to be in that region of the world, and explained it clearly and concisely, and said here is the reason, here is how we are going to go in, here is what we are going to accomplish, here is how we are going to get out, and it convinced American people and convinced this body. A vote was taken, and a supportive vote was taken, and we conducted that engagement very successfully with a great deal of support of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do that in this situation in the world, in Bosnia. The vital interests of the American people have to be explained by the Presidency, and it has not been done to date.

Earlier today a colleague of ours, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], supplied a certain standard for sending young men and women into combat that I thought was a very good one that we should apply into this case when the President presents his case as to why we should send our troops in

□ 1915

He asked the question simply this way: Would I be willing to go? Would I be willing to send my daughter or my son into harm's way for this cause?

It seems to me that is the same standard we should apply in this particular case once we get from the administration what the plan is. Why we are going in? What are the strategic and vital interests? And that has been taken to the countryside, because maybe then we will be convinced that we should be going into Bosnia, we should be protecting that region of the world.

But as of today, we have not seen any compelling case or any real case at all from the administration as to why we should go. Why should we vote or appropriate the funds or allow the use of funds to send our troops into harm's way in that part of the world, when we do not even know what our plan is to go in, to occupy, and how to get out, and what will we declare as victory once we are there.

I have a lot of questions of the administration myself. What is the deployment strategy we are going to have? Let us take that out to the American people. What are the military goals we are going to pursue in this particular area? What is the exit strategy?

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the President of the United States to do what we have learned over years and years of the history of this country when we engage in military conflicts, when our young men and women can be sent into conflict and some can come home not alive, and that is simply this: Take the case to the American people first. Explain to the American people first what are our strategic and vital interests of why we need to be here. Why do we need to do this? Take it there first. And then, Mr. President, come to this body. Come to the Congress and ask for a vote of Congress, so each of us in our conscience can look and ask ourselves, would I be willing to go? Would I be willing to send my son or daughter into harm's way for this cause? And then let us have a vote. That is how a democracy should operate. That is how we should operate in this particular case.

I call on the administration to act that way. It is in their best interests and the best interests of the American people.

INCREASED MONEY FOR BREAST CANCER RESEARCH NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I believe this evening is a very important evening, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership on this issue and for organizing this special order to save lives.

I rise tonight to speak about an issue of vital importance to all of the women of this Nation, and this issue happens to be breast cancer. As a woman and a mother, I feel there are few issues as important as the breast cancer epidemic facing our Nation.

As you may know, breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in American women today. I recall just a few weeks ago joining in with the Susan G. Coleman Foundation in Houston, TX, where some 8,000 women, many of them survivors, gathered to fight against the epidemic of breast

cancer, and to encourage more research in that area.

But the most pointed and the most striking part of it was to see mothers and daughters being able to fraternize and fellowship because of what had occurred in terms of breast cancer detection, to see the survivors, and to see that they were willing to continue the fight.

Currently there are 1.8 million women in this country who have been diagnosed with breast cancer, and 1 million more who have yet to be diagnosed. This year, 182,000 women and 1,000 men will discover they have breast cancer, and 46,000 will die from the disease. Breast cancer costs this country more than \$6 billion each year in medical expenses and lost productivity.

But these statistics cannot possibly capture the heartbreak of this disease which impacts not only the women who are diagnosed, but their husbands, children, and families, and that is what we are talking about today, keeping families together by eliminating this dreaded disease.

We have made some progress in the past few years by bringing the issue to the Nation's attention. Events such as Breast Cancer Awareness Month are crucial to sustaining this attention. There, however, is more to be done. We in Congress must work with the Department of Health and Human Services to implement the national action plan on breast cancer. The plan provides a framework and a plan for activities in three major areas: The delivery of health care, the conduct of research, and the enactment of policy.

It has six major priorities that I think are key to the direction this Congress should take: Identifying strategies to disseminate information about breast cancer and breast health to scientists, consumers, and practitioners using the state-of-the-art technologies available on the information superhighway; merging all of our talents and all of our strengths to help eliminate, as I said, this dreaded disease; establishing biological resource banks and comprehensive patient data registries to ensure a national resource of information for multiple areas of breast cancer research; ensuring consumer input at all levels in the development of public health and service delivery programs; research studies and educational efforts; involving advocacy groups and women with breast cancer in setting research priorities and patient education.

That was done by the Sisters Network in my district, where one such morning they walked an inner-city neighborhood and began knocking on doors to explain to that community about early detection, and wound up at a church on Sunday morning speaking to the women there about the need for early detection. That is the kind of pri-

vate help and partnership that should be going on with the Federal Government on this issue.

Expanding the scope and breadth of biomedical and behavioral research activities related to the etiology of breast cancer; making clinical trials more widely available to women who are at risk for breast cancer; decreasing barriers to participation through consumer-clinician dialog; reduction of economic barriers and other strategies; implementing a comprehensive plan to address the needs of individuals carrying breast cancer susceptibility genes; and recommending educational intervention for consumers, health care providers and at-risk patient groups.

Sadly, the death rate for breast cancer has not been reduced in more than 50 years. One out of four women with breast cancer dies within the first 5 years. Forty percent die within 10 years of diagnosis.

Furthermore, the incidence of breast cancer among American women is rising each year. For women ages 30 to 34, the incidence rate tripled between 1973 and 1987. The rate quadrupled for women ages 35 to 39 during the same period.

This Congress has stood well for solving problems. It is important for us to realize here is a problem to be solved. I am particularly concerned about studies which have found that African-American women are twice as likely as white women to have their breast cancer diagnosed at a later stage, after it has already spread to the lymph nodes. A recent study by the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research found that African-American women were significantly more likely than white women to have never had a mammogram, or to have had no mammogram in a 3-year period before development of the symptoms or diagnosis. Mammography was protective against later stage diagnosis in white women, but not in black women. It is clear that more research and testing needs to be done in this area.

We need to help all women, and particularly our inner-city women, but the most important thing is we need to help families, and breast cancer destroys families.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity. It is so very important for our children, our daughters, our sisters, mothers, and granddaughters, detection, treatment, and prevention. Let us help eliminate this devastating disease.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about an issue of vital importance to the women of this Nation. This issue is breast cancer. As a woman and a mother, I feel that there are few issues as important as the breast cancer epidemic facing our Nation.

As you may know, breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in American women today. Currently, there are 1.8 million women in this country who have been diagnosed with breast cancer and 1 million more

who have yet to be diagnosed. This year, 182,000 women and 1,000 men will discover that they have breast cancer, and 46,000 will die from the disease. Breast cancer costs this country more than \$6 billion each year in medical expenses and lost productivity.

But these statistics cannot possibly capture the heartbreak of this disease which impacts not only the women who are diagnosed, but their husbands, children, and families.

We have made progress in the past few years by bringing this issue to the Nation's attention. Events such as this month's Breast Cancer Awareness Month, are crucial to sustaining this attention. There is, however, more to be done.

We, in Congress must work with the Department of Health and Human Services to implement the national action plan on breast cancer [NAPBC]. The plan provides a framework and a plan for activities in three major areas: the delivery of health care, the conduct of research, and the enactment of policy. Its six major priorities include:

Identifying strategies to disseminate information about breast cancer and breast health to scientists, consumers, and practitioners using the state-of-the-art technologies available on the information superhighway.

Establishing biological resource banks and comprehensive patient data registries to ensure a national resource of information for multiple areas of breast cancer research.

Ensuring consumer input at all levels in the development of public health and service delivery programs, research studies, and educational efforts. Involving advocacy groups and women with breast cancer in setting research priorities and in patient education.

Expanding the scope and breadth of biomedical and behavioral research activities related to the etiology of breast cancer.

Making clinical trials more widely available to women with breast cancer and women who are at risk for breast cancer. Decreasing barriers to participation through consumer-clinician dialog, reduction of economic barriers, and other strategies.

Implementing a comprehensive plan to address the needs of individuals carrying breast cancer susceptibility genes and recommending educational interventions for consumers, health care providers, and at-risk patient groups.

Sadly, the death rate from breast cancer has not been reduced in more than 50 years. One out of four women with breast cancer dies within the first 5 years; 40 percent die within 10 years of diagnosis. Furthermore, the incidence of breast cancer among American women is rising each year. For women ages 30 to 34, the incidence rate tripled between 1973 and 1987; the rate quadrupled for women ages 35 to 39 during the same period.

I am particularly concerned about studies which have found that African-American women are twice as likely as white women to have their breast cancer diagnosed at a later stage, after it has already spread to the lymph nodes. A recent study by the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research found that African-American women were significantly more likely than white women to have never had a mammogram or to have had no mammogram in the 3-year period before develop-

ment of symptoms or diagnosis. Mammography was protective against later stage diagnosis in white women but not in black women. It is clear that more research and testing needs to be done in this area. We also need to increase education and outreach efforts to reach those women who are not getting mammograms and physical exams.

We cannot allow these negative trends in women's health to continue. We owe it to our daughters, sisters, mothers, and grandmothers to do more. Money for research must be increased and must focus on the detection, treatment, and prevention of this devastating disease.

MAINTAIN COMMITMENT TO BREAST CANCER RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my outstanding colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, for organizing this special order.

Mr. Speaker, over 15 years ago I lost my mother to breast cancer, and tonight I rise not only in honor of my mother, but of all the mothers, all the sisters and daughters, the wives, who have died of breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise tonight to salute the many women who have survived this terrible disease—and there are many survivors. We know the grim statistics: in the last 20 years, the incidence of breast cancer has increased by 20 percent. Twenty years ago, 1 in 20 women developed breast cancer. Today, it is 1 in 8. Most Americans have known someone—a mother, sister, friend or coworker affected by this terrible tragedy.

Breast cancer is an extremely complex disease and we are unfortunately far from a cure. We have many more questions about breast cancer than answers. Solving the mystery of breast cancer is like working on an incredibly complicated and frustrating puzzle. Each piece of this puzzle solved is a small victory. The Federal Government's research is helping us to solve this puzzle and to slowly answer these unanswered questions.

One of these unanswered questions is the role the environment plays in breast cancer. Another is the importance of genetics in determining who develops the disease and who does not. Still another question is whether diet can reduce a women's risk of breast cancer.

There is mounting evidence that exposure to pesticides may contribute to breast cancer. For example, a study done several years ago at Mt. Sinai Medical Center in New York found that women with the highest levels of a pesticide compound in their blood were four times more likely to have breast cancer than other women. Another

study in Israel found a 10-percent drop in breast cancer during the same time that there was a drop in the levels of pesticides in human and cow milk. The Long Island breast cancer study will help to answer many other important questions regarding the link between environmental and occupational factors in breast cancer. But again, many unanswered questions remain.

Science has also recently begun to document a genetic link to breast cancer. The breast cancer gene is thought to account for 5 percent of all breast cancer cases but 25 percent of the breast cancer in women under age 30.

Last month, researchers found a particular mutation of this breast cancer gene in 1 percent of a study of Jewish women of Eastern European background. Jewish women with a family history of breast cancer who were found to have this gene had a very high risk of developing breast cancer. However, we don't know what kind of risk women face who have this gene but do not have a family history of breast cancer. So it makes no sense to test women for this gene until we know more. Again, many unanswered questions remain.

Lastly, scientists are beginning to develop a link between nutrition and breast cancer. But again, our knowledge is scanty. We know that the risk of breast cancer increases with the degree of obesity. One small study showed that moderate alcohol use might even increase a woman's risk of cancer because of the influence of alcohol on hormones. Research continues to tell us that a low-fat, high-fiber diet may decrease our risk of many cancers including breast cancer. Exercise may also reduce the risk of the disease. But again, many unanswered questions remain.

Breast cancer poses one of the major scientific challenges of today. I urge my colleagues to look at the many unanswered questions as a challenge to continue to maintain the Federal Government's commitment to breast cancer research and the enforcement of environmental regulations. We must not abandon our commitment to the women of America.

But funding research is not enough. We must support efforts to regulate exposures to chemicals strongly suspected of being linked to breast cancer. Tomorrow we will vote on a motion by Representative STOKES to allow the EPA to enforce the Delaney clause. The Delaney clause protects processed foods from contamination by known carcinogens but Congress has voted to restrict EPA from enforcing the Delaney clause. Congress has also tied EPA's hands by cutting its budget by one-third. This is an outrage. Members have a chance tomorrow to support the Stokes motion to demonstrate that they are truly serious about addressing the breast cancer epidemic.

AMERICAN POLICY IN BALKANS A FAILURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed 3 years of failure as far as the policy of the United States concerning the ongoing tragedy in the Balkans. During this 3 years, we have heard the screams of agony and horror. And what has American policy been? An arms embargo against the criminals who are committing the aggression and the victims alike.

This formula of treating the victims and the criminal alike had left the aggressor with all of the tanks, all of the heavy artillery, and an overwhelming superiority in arms. It led to 100,000 deaths or more. The aggressor was, naturally, not deterred by an arms embargo that prevented the victims from arming themselves and defending themselves against aggression.

□ 1930

We have seen mass rapes, ethnic cleansing and genocide. It has been a tragedy. It has been a fiasco on the part of the Western democracies. It has been a lack of moral leadership from the United States in that we have put the victims and the aggressors in the same category. Yet the victims even though they have been raped and murdered and seen their families destroyed and their homes burned and destroyed have never come to the United States and asked us for ground troops, to put our young people in their place. They have not asked for our ground troops to be deployed, and they still are not asking for our ground troops to be deployed.

The plan that we are hearing about today that President Clinton is suggesting of sending 25,000 young Americans to the Balkans has not come as a result of a request from the victims. It is instead a product of the fuzzy thinking and moral relativity of those people who have formulated America's disastrous policy for the past 3 years. They have failed for 3 years, and now they ask us to trust their judgment in sending 25,000 young Americans into a Balkan meat grinder that has been getting nothing but worse due to their leadership.

No, no, hell, no. Twenty-five thousand Americans put in the Balkans. Part of their plan is to put 20,000 Russians into the Balkans at the same time. Putting 20,000 Russians and 25,000 Americans into a conflict situation like that? That is total insanity.

We have another alternative. We are not talking about isolationism versus international activism here. What we need to do is have a policy that is rational and responsible and not putting our people at maximum risk.

We have the alternative. Let us lift the arms embargo on these victims, on the Croats and on the Bosnians who have been victimized by the aggressor, clearly the aggressor who is grabbing territory in the Balkans. We have invested in smart weapons. We have invested in bombers and aircraft. We have done this to permit us to exercise our influence while minimizing the risk.

The idea of sending so many young Americans to the Balkans carries little chance of success and an incredibly high chance of failure. Failure in this case means a major loss of American lives. The screams and agony that we will hear will not just be coming from the Balkans but will be coming from American homes when their loved ones are lost, when they find out that their loved one has been torn apart by a land mine or by some sort of artillery barrage. Thanksgiving dinner with empty seats. Wives without husbands. Children without fathers.

We should not be putting Americans at risk for such a fiasco, an adventure that has such little chance of success.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from San Diego.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I was attracted to his very articulate statement. He reminds me that when we have the Secretary of Defense before us, the Secretary of State and other leading members of the Clinton administration, the one question they could not answer was, what happens when that one car bomb occurs and you lose 12 or 15 or 20 people? Do you stay there? Do you show resolve? Do you move out immediately?

They offered no answer beyond what has happened already in Somalia and other places. That is, that we are driven out. If we are driven out because of terrorism, then we have lost all of the important things that they talked about. Like holding NATO together, maintaining our credibility with our European allies, et cetera. They never answered that question.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. It is sad and an appropriate question to ask, because I was in the White House in the 1980's when Ronald Reagan made the worst decision of his Presidency, which was to introduce U.S. Marines into the Lebanon conflict. I remember during that time when Ronald Reagan issued the order and the Marines landed, I ran all over the White House, asking, pleading with people, why are we there? What are we doing? How can we possibly succeed?

I went to every office of the decision-makers in the National Security Council, my friends who are in various positions in the government and they said, "DANA, here is the formula. If we do this, this, and this, it will eventually lead to peace in the Middle East."

I said, "This, this and this. For all of these things to happen, the chances of

that happening are very small." The chances of this turning into a fiasco, a horrible situation where we lose maybe 100 American lives, the chances are very high.

I thought they would take care of it. I thought that some of the people who understood the implications of what was going on would handle the situation. But instead we got mixed up in the Lebanon situation, in the crisis. We were mixed up in local politics. Our Marines were actually, people do not understand this, the political situation was so complicated the Marines were ordered not to have bullets in their rifles.

The situation in Bosnia is far more complex than what was in Lebanon. We lost 240 young Marines in Lebanon. Let me say, I will never forget the day when it was announced that this bomb exploded, this car bomb exploded and it was not just 20 Americans, and it was these young Marines and the first name on the list was my brother's best friend from high school, who I grew up with, and I vowed that day that I would never sit back and watch a senseless operation go forward without trying my best to save the lives of those young Americans.

Today we have that opportunity. If we try our hardest and we spread the word, this is a democracy, the President is not going to send troops overseas into a risky situation without the support of the U.S. Congress and the American people. We can deter this, we can bring some sense to this, and we can save some American lives.

I ask the American people, I hope everyone contacts their Congressman and the White House saying no troops to Bosnia, no American troops to Bosnia, unless the Congress approves of this operation.

ENDING WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, this Congress has a chance to end welfare for lobbyists once and for all, ending the insidious practice of allowing Federal grant recipients to use taxpayer dollars while advancing their own narrow special interests.

Much has been written and debated on this issue; but, contrary to many Washington political pundits and the special interests who are desperately trying to save their taxpayer-funded subsidies, the issue is really quite simple. The American people do not want their money going to special interests to lobby Congress.

Consistent with the Republican philosophy that people, not the Government, know best how to spend their own money, the Istook-McIntosh-

Erlich language ends this abuse of taxpayer dollars being used directly or indirectly to lobby by Federal grant recipients. This ban on lobbyist subsidies will ensure the Nation's taxpayers that their money is not being used by Washington lobbyists to promote a special interest agenda they may or may not agree with.

To those who oppose this legislation, I have just one question: If you are not abusing Federal taxpayer dollars now, then what is all the fuss about?

The people who oppose this important reform legislation cannot have it both ways. On the one hand, they argue that they do not lobby with taxpayer dollars, while, on the other hand, they contend that ending their subsidy will directly impact their lobbying efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I think we owe the American people who are taxpayers in this Nation a pledge that we will not let their money be used for any special interest group to lobby in this Capitol or any State capitol around this country. Let us promise to let the people of this country decide who, if anyone, should speak for them.

It may be Halloween, but do not let the ghouls and goblins of taxpayer subsidies past scare you out of doing the right thing for our country. Urge my colleagues in this House and in the other body to end welfare subsidies for lobbyists.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION PLAN HARDLY REVOLUTIONARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, Congress passed an historical budget reconciliation plan—a plan that our Republican colleagues call revolutionary.

A revolution, however, involves more than change—a revolution involves change for the better, forward motion, progress. There is great doubt in my mind, and the minds of many of my constituents, that we are progressing.

While, the deed has been done, and the plan has passed, we are now in conference with the Senate, and there is still time to undo some of the damage from that plan.

If the damage is not undone, we will be left with no choice except to urge the President to veto the bill.

This evening, I want to again highlight the great harm that the Republican plan will do to rural America in the area of health care—because past pleas have been largely ignored.

Rural North Carolina, including my congressional district, like most of rural America, will be especially hard hit by these cuts.

Rural communities lack high paying jobs, often lack the infrastructure necessary for economic expansion and, on

average, have incomes far below the average American. Rural communities will hurt more from the cuts.

The lack of basic resources and opportunities, such as employment, housing, education, and utility services, especially water and sewer, is compounded by limited access to quality health care and a shortage of health professionals, especially primary and family physicians.

The Republicans seem to want senior citizens to have health care that is cheaper.

Democrats want senior citizens to have health care that is better.

Cheaper and better are not the same. You get what you pay for.

They want to cut corners. We want to cut with conscience.

The Republicans want to put seniors in groups and choose doctors for them, because it's cheaper.

Democrats want seniors to choose their own Health Plan or doctors, because it's better.

Under the Republican plan, many seniors in rural North Carolina will be forced to travel many more miles to find a hospital, because it's cheaper.

Democrats want to prevent rural hospitals from closing because of cuts in Medicare, because it's better.

Cheaper could cost less, it could also cost more, but it could cost lives.

Why are the Republicans pushing a cheaper health care plan?

Because they are also pushing an expensive tax cut plan for wealthy Americans.

They have voted to cut the Medicare Program by \$270 billion so that they can pay for a tax cut program of \$245 billion.

If the Republicans dropped their expensive tax cut plan for the wealthy, they would not have to push their cheaper health care plan for seniors.

Citizens of Rural America have incomes that are 33 percent—yes, one third—lower than their urban counterparts.

The elderly who live in rural areas are 60 percent more likely to live in poverty—60 percent.

Twenty-five percent of rural hospitals already operate at a loss, and that is because Medicare alone accounts for almost 40 percent of the average hospital's net patient revenue.

It is estimated that this plan will cost North Carolinians a loss of over \$3,000 for each Medicare recipient in North Carolina between now and the year 2002, and a loss of some \$900 for each recipient each year thereafter.

This cut in Medicare will reduce the size of the program by 25 percent—raising the cost of premiums and copayments to each of North Carolina's 999,000 Medicare beneficiaries.

And, when the Medicare cuts are combined with the cuts in the Medicaid Program, Federal health care dollars coming into North Carolina will be reduced by more than \$15 billion.

The Medicaid cuts affect North Carolinians of all ages—the elderly, children, the disabled, the poor.

There are some 985,000 Medicaid recipients in our State. We would be forced to eliminate coverage for almost half of those Medicaid recipients.

The Medicare cuts will be especially painful, since more than 8 out of 10 of all Medicare benefits go to senior citizens with incomes of \$25,000 or less.

Those who are pushing this cheaper plan fought the creation of Medicare in 1965, and now, in 1995, have voted to do what they failed to do in 1965—cut the comfort of retirement from our senior citizens.

Medicare spending in the rural areas of North Carolina will be cut by \$3.3 billion—a 20 percent cut in the year 2002 alone.

Worse, rural North Carolina will lose some of the limited number of hospitals we have.

Because of poverty, rural hospitals lose money on Medicare, while urban hospitals make a small profit.

The typical rural hospital, under the Republican's plan, will lose some \$5 million in Medicare funding, over 7 years.

Rural hospitals already need 5,084 more primary care physicians to have the same doctor to population ratio as the Nation as a whole.

This harsh Republican plan will mean tougher times for families and especially for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the people really do want change.

But, they do not want change that takes us back 30 years, when more than one out of every two senior citizens had no health care at all.

They do not want change that forces our seniors to choose between heat and health, that is no real choice. They want change that takes America forward. They want change that is better, not cheaper. The people want a real revolution. The conferees should keep that in mind.

If not, the President should veto the bill.

THE BALANCED BUDGET DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about numbers and figures and procedure and how things move through the House and the Senate and get ultimately signed into law or not signed into law; but I think it is important in this debate over a balanced budget that we not lose sight of our real objectives. The question before the American people, and the American people are going to have to answer this question: Do you want more taxes and a larger government or do you want a smaller government and less taxes?

It is hard for politicians to cut spending, whether those politicians are in the White House or in this Chamber or over in the Senate. Members of Congress and the White House have decided that if they do more things for people,

if they spend more money on more programs, if they take some pork-barrel projects, the propensity to get re-elected is greater.

□ 1945

And so that is the tradition that this body has been operating under for the last 40-plus years. In the process of not increasing taxes, we have developed a huge debt for this country, not only the existing debt of \$4.9 trillion that is overwhelming, but we have done more than that. We have now made so many promises that the unfunded liability for Medicare, for example, is another \$5 trillion. The unfunded liability or actuarial debt for social security is another \$3.2 trillion. The promises we have made and not funded for civil service retirees is another half a trillion dollars.

Now recently we have promised every private pension fund that the Federal Government will stand behind that pension fund and make it solvent.

Our goal of what we have called the debt limit coalition, 160 members that have sent a letter to the President, we have also written the Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH; we have written BOB DOLE; we say we think balancing the budget by 2002 or sooner is so important that we are not going to vote to increase the debt ceiling. I mean, that is to give us, some of ourselves, the intestinal fortitude. It is to put pressure on the White House to come to this conclusion.

The Federal Government last year borrowed approximately 41 percent of all of the money loaned out in the United States. Can you imagine what would happen to interest rates if the extra demand of Federal Government borrowing was not there? Can you imagine what the additional funds in the economy for people that want to buy a car or build a home or go to college or, more importantly, expand their business? Can you imagine what a great stimulus that would be?

Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, suggested that if we have got the wherewithal to end up balancing this budget, we have got such a strong underlying economy in the United States we would see jobs and the economy take off like has never happened before.

That is why this body has got to stick to its guns and insist in the reconciliation bill and in these appropriation bills that we end up on the glide path to a balance budget.

Jim Glassman in today's Washington Post said that default just is not a great fear, many Wall Streeters say, and he quotes Mickey Levy who says the market recognizes any default would have nothing to do with economic soundness and everything to do with political game-playing. He says that the meeting that we have arranged tomorrow with Mr.

Druckenmiller and Mr. Langone, who will be speaking at 10 a.m. to a joint meeting of the House and Senate, be available to the press at 11:00, be available at Heritage for a public forum at 12 o'clock and another press luncheon at 1 o'clock, are going to be saying that, look, what is important is the goal that we stick to our guns, that we ultimately have a balanced budget.

I would like everybody listening and my colleagues in the House and the Senate to attend that 10 a.m. meeting tomorrow morning. It is important for our future. We are concerned with the numbers. We are concerned with achieving what is good for America, our kids, and our grandkids, and it is not leaving them a debt and a mortgage. It is ending up with a balanced budget and a strong economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD at statement by Jim Glassman and also a scenario that I have written on the current debt ceiling.

The material referred to is as follows:
[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1995]

WHAT TRAIN WRECK?

(By James K. Glassman)

When President Clinton sat down with advisers to plot a budget in 1993, they told him he had to convince the bond market he was serious about cutting the deficit. Then, perhaps, interest rates would fall, and the economy would prosper.

Bob Woodward relates the scene in his book "The Agenda":

"Clinton's face turned red with anger and disbelief. 'You mean to tell me that the success of the program and my reelection hinges on . . . a bunch of f-ing bond traders?' . . ."

"Nods from his end of the table. Not a dissent."

Having learned this lesson once; Clinton is applying it again. He seems to be hoping that the bond market, spooked by the prospect that a "train wreck" will cause the Treasury to default, will pressure Republicans into a budget compromise.

This time, however, the bond-market strategy is not working. Instead of panicking, Wall Street actually appears encouraged that Republicans are so serious about a balanced budget that they'll risk being blamed for the financial dislocations a train wreck could cause.

Here's what's happening. Leaders of Congress are using a time-honored weapon—the debt ceiling—to force Clinton to accept the budget they passed last week. If Clinton does not relent, then Congress won't raise the limit on the amount of debt the Treasury can issue, now set at \$4.9 trillion.

The White House response has been to brand Republicans as extremists: In order to achieve their Medicare and tax cuts, these loonies would even force the United States to break promises to bondholders, both here and abroad. For example, without the ability to issue new bonds (and thus raise cash), the Treasury might have to postpone interest due on Nov. 15 on some outstanding bonds.

In the language of finance, this delay is called a default—and, in normal circumstances, it's a very big deal.

"You are talking about defaulting on the full faith and credit of the United States for the first time in the history of our country," said Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin a few

weeks ago in a theme he's repeated almost daily.

Rubin's line fits into a broader White House strategy. "The idea," says Rep. Christopher Cox (R-Calif.), "is to make the Republicans look scary and then look safe."

But there may be more to it. The administration appears to be hoping that the prospect of a default will frighten Wall Street and drive down bond prices (which means driving up interest rates). Under this scenario, the Republicans, pushed by their financier pals, will capitulate and soften their budget demands.

But that hasn't happened. Instead of falling, bond prices have risen—as interest rates have dropped. The rate on the 30-year Treasury bond has fallen from 6.6 percent in late September, when Speaker Newt Gingrich made it clear that he would use the debt ceiling to accomplish his budget aims, to 6.3 percent—the lowest level since January 1994.

Default just isn't a great fear, many Wall Streeters say. The market recognizes that any default would have nothing to do with economic soundness and everything to do with political game-playing," Mickey Levy, the chief economist for NationsBank Capital markets, told me.

The market likes the GOP budget, and it likes the economy's current fundamentals—reasonable growth, low inflation. So rates are dropping. "I've talked to traders," said Levy. "They say, 'Oh God, if rates go back up at all [because of default fears], it just gives us an opportunity to buy.'"

Stanley Druckenmiller, who runs the day-to-day operations of George Soros's massive hedge funds, emphasized that. "The market deals in reality and not technicalities." Even if the Treasury technically delays some interest payments, the reality is that the "sovereign risk" involved in buying U.S. bonds will not increase. On the contrary.

Druckenmiller became concerned last month at a dinner with Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) that many members of Congress were under the impression that Wall Street feared a default. Since then, he and Kenneth Langone, who chairs Invermed Inc., a New York investment bank, and founded the Home Depot have been trying to set the record straight.

On Sept. 26, they bought an ad in The Washington Post that said: "Let's not allow fears of temporary 'market instability' to serve as an excuse for equivocating on spending cuts and entitlement reform . . . If the so-called train wreck occurs, the markets will focus, on the eventual outcome. If the markets believe the chaos will finally lead to decisive action, they will rise."

The Congressional Budget Office, in an August report, took the opposite position. "Even a temporary default—that is, a few days delay in the government's ability to meet its obligations—could have serious repercussions in the financial markets," including "a permanent increase in federal borrowing costs."

Even conservative consultant Jude Wanniski warned that Republicans risked "political disaster" by not raising the debt ceiling and that "financial markets . . . would take a severe beating" as default loomed.

But Druckenmiller, who regularly bets billions on the direction of interest rates, scoffs at this notion. He points out that the costs of a train wreck are minor compared with the benefits of a balanced budget. For one thing, the Treasury won't have to keep borrowing. By the simple mechanics of supply and demand, bonds will become scarcer and more valuable. Rates will fall.

At the invitation of Rep. Nick Smith (R-Mich.), Druckenmiller and Langone will be speaking tomorrow to a joint meeting of the House Republican Policy Committee and the Senate Steering Committee—along with Edward Hyman of ISI, who may be the smartest economist on Wall Street, and James Capra of Capra Asset Management, a talented bond trader who formerly worked for the New York Fed.

The message they'll send is expected to be this: Don't waver on your budget goals, and don't worry about the bond market. Adopt sound policies, and interest rates will fall. So far, anyway, that's exactly what they've done.

PANELISTS

Mr. Edward S. Hyman is Chairman of ISI Groups, Inc. For each of the past 16 years, Mr. Hyman has been rated the #1 economist on Wall Street by the Institutional Investor poll of investors. In addition, he oversees the management of almost \$1 billion in bond funds. Mr. Hyman is a regular guest on "Wall Street Week with Louis Rukeyser" and is widely quoted in the domestic and foreign press. ISI's broker dealer clients are institutional investors in the United States and abroad.

Mr. Stanley F. Druckenmiller is Managing Director of Soros Fund Management, a private New York-based investment management firm that serves as principal investment advisor to the Quantum Group of Funds. The Quantum Fund N.V., the oldest and largest fund within the Quantum Group, is generally recognized as having the best performance record of any investment fund in the world in its 26-year history. Mr. Druckenmiller also is chairman and founder of Duquesne Capital Management, an investment advisory firm in Pittsburgh, PA. Overseeing a combined \$12 billion in assets at both Soros Fund Management and Duquesne, he serves as chief investment strategist and lead portfolio manager. As such, he is directly responsible for the funds' global currency, fixed income, and stock market position.

Mr. James R. Capra is the sole shareholder of Capra Asset Management, directing the firm's trading activities. Between January 1991 and January 1995, Mr. Capra was a principal at Moore Capital Management where he directed trading strategies in government securities. Until 1991, Mr. Capra served as Senior Vice President and proprietary trader on the government securities desk at Lehman Brothers. In addition to being one of Lehman Brothers' most profitable traders, Mr. Capra also served as chief strategist for the fixed income group. Between 1980 and 1983, he was an officer at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, where he served as Director of Domestic Economic Research. Between 1974 and 1980, Mr. Capra was the Chief of Budget Projections at the Congressional Budget Office where he coordinated the preparation of budget estimates for annual congressional budget resolutions. His budget projections unit was in charge of CBO calculations of interest on the public debt and the status of the debt relative to the debt limit.

Mr. Kenneth G. Langone is Chairman and Managing Director of Invenmed Associates, Inc., a New York investment bank. Mr. Langone is the founder of The Home Depot, Inc., of Atlanta, and he currently serves on the Home Depot Board and Executive Committee. He is Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Salem National Lease Corp., of Winston-Salem, NC. Mr. Langone also serves on

the boards of Unifi, Inc., of Greensboro, NC; St. Jude Medical, Inc. of St. Paul, MN; Baby Superstore, Inc. of Greenville, SC; and GMIS, Inc. of Malvern, PA.

DEBT CEILING UPDATE

(By Congressman Nick Smith)

The debt ceiling is now close to becoming binding on the Department of Treasury. The latest indication from Treasury is that they will be able to get by the Social Security payments due the first week in November. However, Treasury is arguing that they will not be able to proceed with the regularly scheduled auctions for the week of November 6 without an increase in the debt ceiling. These actions raise cash which allows for settlement of the interest payments due November 15. It is the November 15 interest payment of approximately \$25 billion that Treasury will have difficulty making without a debt ceiling increase.

Our best estimates from the private sector indicate that without disinvestment of trust funds or other extraordinary measures Treasury will face a \$15 billion to \$30 billion problem on November 15. Thus, it is possible that failure to increase the debt ceiling will force extraordinary measures on the Department.

OPTIONS

There are at least three options that we have come across in our discussions with Wall Street analysts. As might be expected, each option has its negatives and its positives. While not advocating any particular option at this time, we thought it would be useful to share what our research has yielded.

1. Temporary Increase in Debt Limit: The first option is to provide for a short term increase in the debt ceiling. This might be justified if Treasury can demonstrate to the Congress that it will be faced with extraordinary measures prior to Congress' passage of the reconciliation bill. In providing for a temporary increase we must be careful not to lose leverage for passage of reconciliation. Some investment analysts have indicated that if Treasury can get by the November 15 layout, it is possible for them to get to the end of February without another increase in the debt ceiling. This would require getting by a low point in the cash balance in early December, but January is a positive cash flow month, and some delay of income tax refunds might provide the opportunity to extend their cash position for several weeks.

Thus, some analysts have suggested a temporary increase in the debt limit which would return to the \$4.9 trillion at a date certain. They note that as Treasury settlements of at least \$25 billion occur each Thursday, it is important which day of the week is chosen for the end of the debt limit extension. They recommended a Friday, as this gives time to reach agreement on a reconciliation bill.

2. Specified Authority to Disinvest Civil Service Retirement Fund: An alternative would be to provide specific statutory authority to allow for a limited disinvestment of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Trust Fund. This fund has more than \$330 billion available. Under 5 U.S.C. §8348, the Secretary of the Treasury may suspend investment and redeem the assets of the fund "before maturity in order to prevent the public debt of the United States from exceeding the debt limit." When the debt ceiling is finally increased, it can be increased sufficiently to restore the Trust Fund with interest. This has been the procedure in the past.

Doing this would allow the debt ceiling to remain at \$4.9 trillion. The disadvantage is that there might be a conflict with those who felt that this would set a precedent allowing Treasury to tap into trust funds for amounts which make the debt ceiling irrelevant. However, our preliminary research indicates that Treasury can already tap into this fund. We could limit the amount by which disinvestment may occur and accomplish the purpose of retaining leverage for the reconciliation. We will be investigating this option further.

3. Allowing Treasury to Securitize Assets, such as the Federal Financing Bank, and Allow Civil Service Retirement Fund to Invest in the Assets: Treasury holds assets, such as the Federal Financing Bank. These assets are capable of being securitized. If the Civil Service Retirement Funds were allowed to replace, say \$30 billion of its Treasury debt with these assets, then the Treasury could go into the markets and raise cash. We are just beginning to explore this option.

LOSS OF LEVERAGE

It is important to examine whether Treasury can manage the cash after November 15 with no need for an increase in the debt limit for several weeks. If this were the case, then a veto of the reconciliation bill could serve the President until several months into the current fiscal year and jeopardize the seven year balanced budget. There are two December problems. One is an early December interest payment which would require cash. The second is a late December coupon settlement with Social Security that, under normal conditions, would increase the debt by required issuance of Government Account Securities. We are currently trying to obtain reliable cash flow estimates for December and January. Of course, requiring the debt limit to return to \$4.9 trillion on a day certain under the first option, and similarly limiting the length of time under the second and third options would protect against this scenario.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, October is breast cancer awareness month. I wish to briefly address this Chamber on that important subject, since it has taken on an imminence for myself and my family in recent months.

Seven and one-half months ago my wife learned that she had breast cancer. This has had a dramatic effect on us. Yet it is altogether too common, and I wish to emphasize some important points.

First, hope. I think that altogether too many Americans feel that cancer is a death sentence. Indeed, that is not the case, especially with breast cancer. If early detection occurs, the long-term survival rate is high. In fact, it is dramatically high, and it indicates that, indeed, treatment is available. Treatment is within the reach of all Americans. The important thing is to actually learn whether or not you have a malignancy.

This brings me to the second point I would like to emphasize, and that is that one must face the situation realistically. Women and, yes, even men, must be aware that they can contract breast cancer and that they should have mammograms. Women should have mammograms, and they should otherwise check to determine whether or not there are lumps or thickenings that indicate the possibility of a malignancy and have checkups. See a physician. Certainly that is something that is widely publicized in this country but, on the other hand, it is altogether too easy to ignore the advice. If the advice is taken and early detection occurs, then hope is a realistic opportunity.

The third point I wish to emphasize is care in our life-styles. Certainly there are indicators of the risk of breast cancer, a history in the family, other considerations. But still a significant majority of the breast cancer cases cannot be predicted based on these indicators, the family history and other considerations. It appears that it is important for us all to lead responsible lives and to avoid habits which increase our risk of cancer and other health problems.

At this point I think that it is safe to say the Federal Government has become a very active participant in assisting women in determining whether or not they have a malignancy and encouraging mammograms and providing assistance for mammograms and establishing standards for mammography. The Federal Government has been very active in helping give hope, that is, developing treatment programs, sponsoring research on what treatment is effective, and I know that we will continue to be very active and aggressive at the Federal level in the research and encouraging treatment.

But that does not mean that the Federal Government can do everything. We certainly have learned over the last several years that that is not a realistic expectation, and I do not think any American has that expectation. We must assume personal responsibility, personal responsibility for healthy life-styles, personal responsibility for regular checkups, and personal responsibility for following through on recommended treatment regimens.

In closing, I wish to reemphasize the point that problems do not go away if they are simply ignored, but instead we must be vigilant, and whether it is budget discussions such as have occurred here on the floor earlier this evening and I am sure will continue, or matters concerning health care, we must continue to take responsibility for our lives, to encourage our family and our friends to take responsibility for their lives and, finally, to be supportive of individuals who find themselves in this tragic and unfortunate situation.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT K. DORNAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

I want to talk about a friend of mine, BOB DORNAN from California, and the reason I want to talk about him is because he was a great fighter pilot. At one time, he flew F-100's out there, and you know, I always said fighter pilots do it better than anybody. And BOB came up here and proved it, and in fact, the gentleman from California, Mr. HUNTER, and I and the gentleman from California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and DORNAN consider that name that he stuck on us as Tiger Flight as a real honor to be a part of a group like that.

Let me just tell you what he did, because we are talking about Bosnia now and the possibility of sending troops in. Every time you turn around, DORNAN is in there at the hot spot trying to find out what really went on, and let me just refresh your memory about Somalia, which was a disaster for the United States.

He flew in there in a chopper over the site where our chopper was shot down and those troops were killed, and found out that they could have very easily gotten those guys out, very easily blocked the troops, brought pictures back which I saw, and with two or three tanks they could have locked them up and rescued our forces. They did not do that.

Do you know why? Because they were under U.N. control, and the U.N. faulted in their chain of command, which we face here in Bosnia, the same sort of thing, even though it is NATO. There were Italian tanks there, but they were unable to do the coordination to get them there in time.

BOB DORNAN brought the evidence back. Guess what, we pulled out of Somalia with those losses and just wrote those guys off. I do not think that we want to write off any more Americans anywhere in this world.

It was kind of a quagmire over there, and BOB went over there, "Bullet Bob" as they called him, because he is fast on the trigger and he shoots at liberals without an instant's hesitation.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

You know, I am reminded, in Somalia, because BOB DORNAN is a guy who really dedicates himself to this Chamber and to his obligation as a U.S. Congressman, and while the rest of us were doing a few things on Somalia, we were getting the briefings, we were participating in the few areas where Members of Congress were given some leave by

the administration to register our feelings, but BOB DORNAN went to Somalia.

Going there and back, I think is about a 40-hour plane ride which none of us would look forward to, and in the end, BOB DORNAN contacted every family of a uniformed service member who was killed in Somalia, and he talked to them, and he let them know how much they were appreciated, and their loved ones were appreciated. He did a total analysis of the situation and reported back to those of us on the Committee on Armed Services, in fact, to the whole Congress in great detail.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Did he not go see some of them?

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely. He went to see a number of the family members of people who had died and members of people who had been wounded, members of the uniformed services who had been wounded. I can remember members of the families sitting, coming, driving or flying from their homes around the United States to be here in this Chamber and meet BOB and listen to his description of what happened.

So BOB was a great ambassador, not just for the uniformed service members themselves but for their families. I think that is representative of everything he has done. He has been, as you said, to every single military hot spot around the world. He goes there when it is hot.

He went to Vietnam literally dozens of times, and a person who really cares about the security of this Nation. You know, he is the only Member of this body who is running for President, and I think he is a great candidate. And he is a guy who, it is kind of interesting that BOB DORNAN is probably the most unpolitical for a guy who has been in Congress for 20 years or more, the most unpolitical Member of this body, because he rarely does things that make sense purely from a political standpoint, from an analytical, how will this advance my career, how will this help me, how will this position assist me from my standpoint.

I can remember when I was a freshman in this House, and we were competing for the Armed Services seat that came up in California with the retirement of one of our senior Members, and all of those who were competing for that seat, myself included, would get up and make a speech. Then we would have, at the end of the speeches, we would have a vote by the members of the California delegation as to who got that seat, and BOB DORNAN got up and started to speak for himself as all the rest of us had. We all were self-promoters except BOB. Halfway through the speech, he stopped and said, "You know, we really should give this seat to DUNCAN HUNTER, a Vietnam veteran from San Diego." He gave about 5 reasons why we should vote for me. He said, "I am voting for DUNCAN," and sat down. I won the seat as a result of that.

I think Members of the body looked at BOB and said, "Why would you do that? That was the most unpolitical thing you could do. You had a good chance of winning it yourself."

But a few years later, here is BOB DORNAN back not only as a member of that committee, the Committee on National Security, but also the chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee where he has done a lot this year to make lives better for our military families, and he is also the chairman of a very important subcommittee in the Intelligence Committee, which is the Technical and Tactical Intelligence Subcommittee.

□ 2000

As the gentleman mentioned, BOB DORNAN has a lot of smarts with respect especially to national security. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

FURTHER TRIBUTE TO ROBERT K. DORNAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas, SAM JOHNSON, the famous fighter pilot.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

They call the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] B-2 Bob. I think that he has been an armed services advocate for this Nation and has kept our forces strong, especially the Air Force's. I think that this is one case where we are not supposed to be going to Bosnia, and I would like to get on that subject again, if I can, for just a second, because that is a place where the President has offered 25,000 of our troops as a bargaining chip before there is ever any agreement, before the United States has ever been involved.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out earlier that NATO, as an organization for protection of NATO nations, which we are a part of, but I do not believe Bosnia is a NATO nation. I think that is right, is it not, Mr. HUNTER?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for asking, and no, it is not a member of NATO.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Therefore, why are we there? I have asked the question, is this Nation really taking a good look at itself. Who are we, why are we there? Whose side are we on, and what are we going to do once we get there without a plan to get out. I think this President ought to start listening to this Congress and to the American people, and I know BOB DORNAN feels the same way.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, I thank the gentleman. BOB DORNAN is my candidate. I

am endorsing my great seatmate and buddy just north of the San Diego County line, BOB DORNAN. His motto is faith, family, and freedom. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has run under that banner for a long time.

We just saw his effect as a conscience, one of the House consciences along with HENRY HYDE and CHRIS SMITH of the pro-life value and ethic in this Congress, how he has been such a leader there. He has a great family, and that faith, family, and freedom is something that always resonates, at least when I see BOB, because I think of his great family.

Sally, I call her Sally Kay Dornan, it is really Sally Hansen Dornan, is a wonderful person. I know her very well, and she helps to preside over their five children, Robin Marie Griffin, Robert Kenneth, II, Teresa Anne Cobin, Mark Douglas and Kathleen Regina Penn, and they have eight grandchildren and I am going to name them, since we have them right here. Richard K. Cobin, Terry Cobin, Kevin Gary Griffin, Collin Robert Griffin, Anna Victoria Cobin, Erin Marie Griffin, Haley Olivia Dornan. Of course, BOB DORNAN's uncle was the "Tin Man", Jack Haley, in the "Wizard of Oz," so that is where Haley comes from, and of course rounding off with Robert K. Dornan, III.

Let me tell you, if you go to BOB DORNAN's house, you do not see any of what the national news media complains about as being a mean demeanor or tough or ill-willed, all of the tough stands that he takes when he sees real liberalism on the horizon. You see a grandfather who lives for those kids. You drive up to that big ex-hockey player's house out there in McLean and you will see BOB DORNAN coming down, if it is in the wintertime, a bobsled run that would challenge what we have in the winter Olympics, and he may have a camera mounted on the front of his helmet and have four or five grandkids cuddled in his arms, or he may be throwing water balloons at them out of the top story of that house. BOB DORNAN lives for his family.

He has a great family. I can remember once watching the Larry King Show, a detractor sitting there and talking about taking on BOB DORNAN in a race, and the phone rang and Larry King took it and it was Mark from California. That was Mark Dornan, his son. When Mark Dornan finished with that particular guest, it was clear who had won. That is how close that Dornan family is.

So faith, family, freedom. BOB DORNAN has a lot to offer this country, and I think he has injected a lot of value, a lot of ethics and a lot of real conservative spirit into this presidential race. I would be happy to yield, having talked so long, to the great fighter pilot, the gentleman from Texas Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I just want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we had a great time in Texas, incidentally, talking to all of the defense industry in this last year with myself and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and we had BOB DORNAN there that time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, he was there, yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, DUKE CUNNINGHAM also, and a lot of the ideas that we had for preserving the defense industrial base of this country, we have started to carry out in this Republican-led Congress, and you have been a big part of that.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been a revolution for the military.

Mr. HUNTER. So I thank the gentleman from Texas so much, and God bless ROBERT DORNAN. I hope you are out there campaigning hard today, BOB.

OUT-OF-CONTROL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, this House has performed some groundbreaking work by ranging in on the Nation's out-of-control budget. Before we passed a reconciliation bill last week, Americans had been weighed down by the annual deficits that exceeded \$200 billion a year. Their children were saddled with a national debt of almost \$5 trillion. On its way to that historical reconciliation bill which balances the Federal budget in less than 7 years, Members of this House made some difficult decisions to lift that weight from Americans' shoulders and to free future generations of a lifetime of government servitude.

However, Mr. Speaker, the House's work is not finished. There is one more tough decision left on the table, the decision to lift and end subsidies for special interests. This welfare program is actually a Federal grant system. Under this system, Federal agencies award money to private organizations to perform various services. Unfortunately, these services and the agencies that are paid to perform them, are not always the wisest use of taxpayers' dollars. Expense amounts, and this expense, and this is important, this expense amounts to \$40 billion a year.

Fortunately, just as Americans called on Congress to balance the Federal budget, so they have called on Congress to end this unofficial entitlement for special interests. The interests I speak of are those who represent advocacy groups that, because they are

classified by the Internal Revenue Service as tax exempt, see themselves as charities. But some of these organizations do not practice charity. Charity is generosity, helpfulness, relief given to needy or suffering people.

What some of these advocacy groups practice, however, is really greed and influence. These organizations do not extend a helping hand to the poor and the needy, they extend their open hand, palm up, to the taxpayers for a handout. Many times, this money goes directly into the organization's coffers to hire more lobbyists who, in turn, ask Congress and Federal agencies for even more money and more legislation and regulations sympathetic to their organization's political agenda.

Americans cannot afford to have special interest charities double-dipping from the public trough, using the net gain from this tax-exempt status to pay lobbyists to hit Congress up for additional money and power. Americans are no longer interested in funding this profane grant system.

A national study performed just last month showed that a strong majority of Americans do not believe that special interest groups who receive funding from the Federal Government should be using these funds, either directly or indirectly, to lobby the Federal Government. By a margin of 70 to 26 percent, Americans agree that tax dollars should not be used to fund political activities. Of course, many of these nonprofit advocates claim that they are not using Federal money to lobby Congress. They maintain that there is a law against such a practice, and that they follow this law. But there is no way to verify this, because no group is required to open their books to Federal inspection.

What is wrong here, and what is wrong with this picture? If an organization is going to use a taxpayer dollar, especially at a time when the dollar is spread so thin, then the organization should account for every penny and prove that the money is being spent appropriately and as it was supposed to be spent.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending in this House that would bring integrity to the Federal grant system and end this unofficial entitlement for lobbyists. Members will soon have an opportunity to vote on the Istook amendment to the Treasury-Postal conference report. If passed, any portion that receives more than one-third of its revenue in Federal funds, could spend no more than \$100,000 on advocacy activities. Any nonprofit group with able activities of 300 million or more that engages in political activities will be prohibited from receiving Federal grants.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes, I do.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention to the gentleman from

Minnesota that in the Treasury-Post Office conference committee I offered an amendment to the Istook-McIntosh bill that said groups and organizations that spend less than \$25,000 a year on lobbying efforts and government outreach and contact would be exempted. That actually exempts 96 percent of these groups that we do need to have input from homeless shelters, museums, art galleries, symphonies and so forth, and that amendment takes away so much of the argument against the Istook bill that people have been giving us, where we need input, and we said okay, we have an amendment that took care of that.

You know, I agree with the gentleman that the big, big money involved in this has been abused by people who say well, we are not lobbying. If they are not, why not support the bill?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I was just going to get to that, that the amendment that you offered would exempt 96 percent of those groups. What we are really talking about is a handful of people that have abused this system. But frankly, the abuse could amount to \$200 million a year. It is time for it to stop. We cannot afford a subsidy for special interests. I think most people agree that it is wrong, and we will have an opportunity in the next several weeks to end subsidies for special interests.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time has expired. I yield back the balance of my time.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION IMPORTANT FOR OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, happy Halloween. What I wanted to talk about tonight, and I am joined by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] and some others perhaps later, this reconciliation process, this huge budget, this huge bill that we have been hearing so much about in the House and why it is so important. It is a massive bill, it is an important bill. It is right that all eyes of the Nation should be watching this particular piece of legislation. It is the bill that calls for a billion dollar budget, calls for Medicare reform, reforms that say protect and preserve Medicare. It changes the way we do our Medicaid allocation.

It has welfare reform in it, it has medical savings accounts and a tax cut for the hardworking middle class America. It is a very important bill, and it is one that we all have a horse in the race on, and so I wanted to talk about that a little bit tonight.

Let me yield the floor to Mr. GUTKNECHT. He has been a valuable

part of this as a freshman Member of this House. He knows that it was the freshman class who put the majority agenda forward, starting with the Contract With America, 10 items, 9 of which have passed the House, and then went to work on the 13 appropriations bills, even after the other body voted to end the balanced budget amendment, working on the 13 appropriations bills, saying that it is clear that the American people want a balanced budget.

That is what your freshman class ran on and that is what you followed through on, was a balanced budget. So let me yield the floor to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I said to the people of my district that it was a very historic day when we passed that reconciliation bill. It really is what an awful lot of us came here to do. This is what we promised we were going to do when we ran for election, and I am so delighted that we finally got the opportunity to keep that promise. My sense is that if the President hears from the American people, once they understand what really is in this bill and how the bill was put together and they begin to tell the President and the administration how they feel about it, my sense is that the President will reconsider, and he will actually sign this bill or one that looks almost like it.

If I could say to the gentleman from Georgia, I want to just talk a little bit about what we are really doing, because we have heard so much demagoguery and so much rhetoric about these draconian cuts and how this is going to hurt this group or that group. But the truth of the matter is, what we have taken is a fairly simple approach to how we are going to balance this budget. It breaks down into, in my opinion, three categories. First of all, with defense spending, we have adopted essentially a flexible freeze on defense spending.

□ 2015

On domestic discretionary spending we have made targeted cuts. We have eliminated 300 programs, which I think most people would agree were not very effective anyway.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me interject quickly. Many of these cuts are real cuts. Others are just slowing down of the increase and still others are consolidating programs.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, he is absolutely correct.

Then on the entitlement side, and this is where there is so much fear mongering going on out there with the senior citizens and other groups, for the most part whether we are talking about school lunches or talking about Medicare or the other entitlements, what we are really talking about is

slowing the growth rate to approximately the inflation rate.

The good news is if we do that, if we make targeted cuts in domestic discretionary spending, put a flexible freeze on defense and allow the entitlements to grow, but at a slower rate than they have in the past, the good news is we get to a balanced budget, under the plan that we have, scored by the CBO, in 7 years. My own sense is it is going to be about 5½ years, because we will see economic growth at a higher rate than is currently expected and we will see interest rates at a much lower rate than is currently expected.

The net of that is we will get to a balanced budget in about 5½ years, not 7 years. But the even better news, for those of us with children, is that we will have an opportunity, if we can stick to that discipline, which I do not think is a bitter pill to swallow. It is not tough medicine we are talking about. But if we can stick to the basic budget plan, not only will we balance the budget in 5½ years, the great news is if we stay on that path we will pay off the national debt in about 25 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to a conversation that the gentleman from Minnesota and I had earlier today, and that is the basic premise of this whole bill, which is balancing the budget, and why should we balance the budget?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield once more, the interesting thing is some people have turned this into an arithmetic exercise. It is not about arithmetic. It is not about a lot of the things that we are reading about. It really is about preserving the American dream for our children.

President Kennedy said we all cherish our children's future. We all want our kids to have a little better life than we had. But if we stay on the path we are on now at the Federal level, if the Federal Government continues to mortgage our children's future, what we do is we guarantee that our kids will have a standard of living that will be less than ours.

As a matter of fact, we promised them, or we are promising them under the current circumstances, if we do not make changes, that they will face sure bankruptcy for the Federal Government and our economy.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is it not true that if a baby is born this year, in fact, I have one, little Walker Watson, who is my nephew, he was born in April. Now, I understand his share of the national debt, should he live 75 years, which I am hopeful that he will and beyond that, he will owe \$187,000 on the national debt in his lifetime, just interest. Just interest. Not paying down the principal but just interest.

And we also know that the interest on the national debt is almost \$20 bil-

lion a month. Does the gentleman happen to know offhand what the budget of Minnesota is? The annual budget.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the annual budget for the State of Minnesota is about \$10 billion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the same for Georgia, it is about 10, a little over \$10 billion a year. So each month we spend on interest, the budget of Minnesota plus the—

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that is the total budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. The total budget of Minnesota, plus the total budget of Georgia, we spend their annual budgets, combined together, just on interest on the debt. All that money that could be going to health care, that could be going to Medicare, that could be going to education, or, best of all, back to the taxpayers. But it is going straight to the creditors.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing, and I use this example sometimes in my district, because my district borders the Mississippi River. We are just a little west of the Mississippi River. I tell people this, and this gets their attention. I say if they forget everything else that I say they should remember this. Every dollar in personal income taxes collected west of the Mississippi River now goes to pay the interest on the national debt.

That is an amazing statistic. And when the gentleman used the other one, the one he just mentioned, \$187,000 in interest for every baby born in America today, that is disgraceful, and I think we all know it is morally wrong.

Mr. KINGSTON. So, Mr. Speaker, if we are building the case, then, we need to balance the budget, the gentleman mentioned a minute ago about the interest. Alan Greenspan, before I think a Senate committee and I believe a House committee as well, said that if we balanced the budget, because the Federal Government would not have to borrow as much, then, as a big fish in the lending marketplace, it would ease up the drive to increase interest rates to the private sector and the interest rates would actually fall 1 to 2 percent.

If that is the case, then the American taxpayers, who are paying monthly car installments, mortgages each month on their home, credit card, or whatever else they are borrowing on, their interest rates will in turn go down, will they not?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Oh, absolutely. The interesting thing is, when we look at the benefits long term of a balanced budget, and they accrue to everybody. It is not going to benefit just the rich or benefit just the old or the young. I think some of the biggest beneficiary factors, and we have heard a lot of complaints about what will happen to student loans.

The truth of the matter is, the changes we have made in student

loans, if someone borrows the maximum, work out to about \$7 a month. But let us talk about that college student. They are better able to find a job because the economy will be stronger according to all the leading economists we have heard from. But if they borrow money to buy a car, a \$15,000 car loan, annually, the difference in interest rates because we have a balanced budget, will work out to about \$180.

That is good, but what gets great is the difference on a \$100,000 mortgage. If that college student goes out and gets a \$100,000 mortgage, and if interest rates drop by 2 percentage points, that will save that college student \$2,162 a year. On a 30-year mortgage we are talking lots and lots of money.

So, Mr. Speaker, for what we are doing with college loans and some of the other targeted cuts we are making in this budget, it seems to me that long term those benefits to those college students are going to be absolutely astronomical. The people who should be leading the debate or leading the fight for this budget ought to be young people. They should be saying, "this is the kind of thing we need to save our future."

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to be joined by some of our colleagues.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I see we have the distinguished president and chairman of the "theme team," the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], and the distinguished freshman gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] and then we have the guy from Arizona that shows up regardless.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I really appreciate the fact that he treats me with such respect when we come to these things.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not remember anyone yielding.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota might yield for a moment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Actually, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] controls the time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will yield.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman. Actually, I thought I heard the gentleman say that there were going to be cuts in spending on education. Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No, what I said is we are going to change the way student loans are administered, and the absolute maximum that it will cost the average college student is \$7 a month.

Mr. HOKE. That is the amount more. I think it is really important. We keep hearing this language over and over and over again about cuts. The amount of money that we are spending on the

student loan programs and education goes from \$24 billion in fiscal year 1995 to \$36 billion in fiscal year 2002, which everywhere in the world, except within the Federal City, is clearly an increase of \$12 billion. \$12 billion out of \$24 billion is a 50 percent increase. We are increasing spending on college loans 50 percent over the next 7 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. And, Mr. Speaker, we are spending more on Pell grants that we ever have and keeping historically black colleges at a level amount. Those are not being cut.

We have also level funded the TRIO program, which includes the important Talent Search Education Program and Upward Bound.

So the gentleman is absolutely correct. There will be more students participating in student loan programs than ever before in history. And yet I hope they are smart enough to maybe tell some of our Democratic colleagues that that does not constitute a cut.

Mr. HOKE. What is disturbing, Mr. Speaker, with all the student loans, one would hope there is more arithmetic being taught than what is apparently being taught around here.

The only thing I wanted to point out about the idea of cuts is there has been a cut in the Federal budget. There absolutely has been a cut, and that is in the area of international aid. Of foreign aid.

We voted on this conference report today. We have cut \$1.5 billion from 1995 to fiscal year 1996.

Mr. KINGSTON. And we voted on the legislative branch. The U.S. Congress has taken a cut. We have reduced our staff one-third.

Mr. HOKE. That is absolutely right.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] better get more aggressive, because if you want floor time, we do not yield readily.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues that I come from a very quiet polite district, and if my friends want me to talk, I will be glad to.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. HAYWORTH, it is your turn.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, I simply wanted to say in defense of the gentleman from South Carolina, knowing his district well, and the golden corner from Pickens and Oconee County, on down through Aiken and down to North Augusta, I know that he, beneath that calm, cool exterior, has a rather tenacious trait and is one who stands up for the working people of his district.

Indeed, I think that is the point we want to make tonight, that we are foursquare behind the working people.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. Does the gentleman see why we do not yield to him?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman would yield, I will go over the \$10.08 billion in savings we achieved in the

student loan program, because I am on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

It goes back to the student lunch program. That was the biggest lie in this Congress. We put more money in the lunch program, the federally funded lunch program, than the President did, but we got accused of cutting.

The student loan savings entail the following: We save \$1.2 billion of the \$10 billion from doing away with direct lending. Direct lending is the best opportunity to recreate the great society that I have seen since we have been in Congress. Direct lending has the Federal Government borrowing the money, allowing the Department of Education to lend it out and become bankers.

The opportunity for the Department of Education to grow under direct lending is unbelievably large. We are in debt. We are having to borrow money we do not have and lend it to replace private capital. We save \$1.2 billion by reducing the bureaucracy of the Department of Education by getting rid of direct lending.

Mr. HOKE. If the gentleman would yield for one point on that. It might be helpful to point out to the Speaker, because I see the Speaker was not here when this law was made, when that direct lending program was entered into.

I suppose, being on the committee, the gentleman could probably could tell us that. If he cannot, I can help out.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, direct lending is a Bill Clinton program that is trying to replace private sector capital. There are literally hundreds of banks in America that provide money that the Federal Government guarantees to provide access to student loans.

Bill Clinton wants to get rid of the guaranteed loan program and replace it with direct lending, where the Federal Government becomes the bank. They have to borrow the money to replace the capital in the private sector. And the bankers will be people who run the Department of Education.

I do not know about my colleagues, but if I was to start a bank, I would not go to the Department of Education to hire people to run the bank.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman obviously knows his history. He is absolutely right: 1993 budget resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue yielding, we have not even warmed up yet, \$5 billion of the \$10 billion came from the banking institutions.

I will readily admit that the guaranteed loan program in this country needs to be reworked. It was a deal negotiated by our brethren on the other side who built the Great Society.

Listen to this. Under the guaranteed loan program, the Federal Government was reimbursing 100 percent of any default prior to this Congress. Excuse me,

two Congresses ago. Now it was at 98. We have come into 95. We have doubled the amount of risk that the private sector has in the student loan program.

Do the other gentleman think they would spend much time on a defaulted loan if they knew somebody was to pay them 100 percent of the default? We have doubled the amount of risk that banks have, we have doubled the amount of money we charge for them to participate in the student loan program. We have \$5 billion by renegotiating a deal for the American taxpayer with the banking institution. Sixty percent of the savings came away from reducing government and renegotiating a bad deal with the banking world that our brethren on the other side negotiated.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is we save taxpayer money and we get more student scholarships out there. What could be better?

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely. And let us get where the students become involved.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] hit it right on the head there. What we have done from the student aspect is that, from the time a student graduates until 6 months after he graduates, there is a grace period where we forgive the interest. What we have done is we have allowed the interest to run during that 6-month period and saved \$3.5 billion for the American taxpayer.

If an individual borrowed the most money there is to borrow for the longest period of time, his payment would be affected, at the most, \$9. The average student will have to increase payments by an average of \$4 per month, but it saves \$3.5 billion to the American taxpayer.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would repeat that, because I think it is the central part of our debate. I think it is very important. If the gentleman would repeat the terms that we have changed here.

□ 2030

Mr. GRAHAM. The only thing we done to a student participating in the student loan program is the 6-month grace period where we have forgiven the interest in the past, the interest will continue to run. You do not have to pay the interest if you cannot afford it, but it will run in that 6-month period. And when we look at all the loans out there, it adds up to \$3.5 billion savings for the American taxpayer and no one student will be affected over \$9 a month.

If we have gotten to where students cannot afford to help \$4, \$5, \$9 a month to help balance the budget and lower the interest rate 2 percent, we are hopelessly lost in this country. Two-thirds of the high school students go into the workforce. What about their families?

I got a student loan and my sister got Pell Grants when my parents died. We paid the loans back. I am thankful for the Pell grants, but what we have done is put more money in the Pell grants, but we focused to the target population. We have reduced the income level so that we are really helping people that need it the most. We have stopped being everything to everybody. That is what has happened in the last 40 years. We are giving away government money faster than we could print it.

The last \$500 million savings comes in this fashion. Every parent in America can go and borrow money under the PLUS Program. What that does is if your child, because of your income, is ineligible for student loans, you can go to the Federal Government and borrow money for a college education yourself. We have increased the interest rates from 3.1 to 3.9 percent above the Treasury rate, which is still better than anything you can get on the open market. That saves \$500 million. That will affect the average payment of a family \$3.

That is the \$10.08 billion. Sixty percent of it came from the banking institutions and reducing the Department of Education. No one student will pay over \$9 a month more. The average student will pay \$4 a month more to save \$3.5 billion to help balance the budget.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I have to salute the gentleman from South Carolina, because even on this All Hallows Eve, he again demonstrates that facts will overcome fear. And how sad it is that our liberal friends, so bereft of ideas, so divorced from a reasonable discussion on different philosophies of policy, only turn time and again to fear mongering and scare tactics.

I think the fact that our friend from South Carolina has brought forth these items of information in a reasonable, rational way, really befits the entire revolution that is going on here. Because it is revolution, as we know, built not on anything more than what is reasonable and rational and long overdue for the hard-working men and women of this country who are paying the bills. Government does not supply this; taxpayers supply this.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman touched on a point about working versus not working, and I have often heard someone say the difference between a Republican and Democrat is that a Democrat gets money from Washington and Republicans send money to Washington.

We have earlier in the day been talking about welfare reform, big welfare reform legislation tied up into the reconciliation bill. You gentlemen have been involved in that. There are four basic components: No money for illegal aliens; State block grants for flexibility; discouraging teenage pregnancy; and work requirements.

Let us just talk about that for a few minutes. There are some other things in her that we want to talk about. Mr. GUTKNECHT?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would just say the byword of the welfare reform, and perhaps the byword or the expression of this whole Congress, is how do we convert this welfare State that has been created over the last number of years into an opportunity society?

I think that is what we really trying to do. The real issue is how do we get away from government responsibility for everything, where everybody is blaming the government and everybody is going to the government for more funding and more programs and so forth, and how do we get more personal responsibility?

At the end of the day I think we all know that we cannot have a system that relies on the government for all of the answers. The government has done such a poor job. When we look at the welfare system, and the welfare State if you will, the war on poverty has spent something like \$5.3 trillion over the last 30 years. And the real tragedy of our welfare system and the tragedy of the failure of the welfare State is not that its cost \$5.3 trillion. The real tragedy is that it has denied so many human beings of the dignity of work and responsibility.

What we are really trying to do is convert the welfare State into an opportunity society and rebuild those basic values and those basic principles of faith, family, work, and personal responsibility. That is what we have got to have. That is what we want. That is what the American people want.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. HAYWORTH has been a champion of the working man and that this is the working man's Congress. Does that fit into this?

Mr. HAYWORTH. As the gentleman from Georgia knows, because he hears it from his constituents, I will point out what I hear time and again from the people of the Sixth District of Arizona. From people who are working hard to set up their own businesses; people who are working hard in the private sector to create more jobs; people who are working hard to put food on the table and build a future for their families. They are absolutely enthused that with this new Congress, we see the end of business as usual in Washington.

Oh, the protestations from the other side are sometimes cacophonous, that is, loud. But, that central truth remains very prevalent. When we consider the fact that in 1948, the average American family of four sent 3 percent of its income in the form of taxes to Uncle Sam. Then to have that accelerate for an average family of four in 1994 to almost one-quarter of that family's income, almost 25 percent, 24 percent, is absolutely unconscionable.

What I am hearing from the people of the Sixth District is this simple fact:

They work hard for the money they earn. They are patriotic Americans. They believe in this country. They are not upset about doing their fair share, but that is exactly the point. What is their fair share?

I think as the gentleman knows, again, a lot of disinformation bandied about by our friends on the other side, and indeed some in the fourth estate who seem to be almost in complicity with them, repeating what can only be described as falsehoods. The gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue characterizes our welfare reform package as, quote, "Cutting off benefits to teenage mothers."

Well, there is one 4-letter word that the President forgets, and it is not a bad word. It is an important word. C-A-S-H, cash benefits, for mothers under the age of 18. We have not moved to eliminate the Women, Infants and Children's program. We have not moved to eliminate those things that truly provide a safety net. But what we have sought to do is to end what appears to be an endless subsidization of illegitimacy in this country.

Not to demonize any young lady, not to demonize any particular group, but simply to say, as my friend from Minnesota points out, over \$5 trillion on the war on poverty. That eclipses our national debt. Clearly it has not worked and there is another route to take is that is what we are doing.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from South Carolina actually has been on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. The gentleman has been involved in this debate. Is it moving in the right direction? Are we helping the working man?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the most complaints I get about welfare come from the recipients themselves. We have created a system somehow over the last 40 years that if recipients want to live together as man and wife under the same roof, they get punished because the income levels may go up a dollar too much and the dad or the mom have to live separate and apart to maintain their benefit package.

If recipients want to work part-time, they are trying to get off of welfare and create a resume, a job portfolio, they go to work part-time and they make a dollar too much, they lose their Medicaid. The number one reason people stay on welfare is the Medicaid, the health insurance.

We have created a system where recipients have to pick and choose between working. In Aiken, South Carolina, two weeks ago I went to a housing project to listen to people about the reforms that we are engaging in. There was a young woman on the front row who was going to college part-time. She had a young child. She was receiving AFDC. She was living in the public housing unit. She was very proud of the job she was doing working part-time.

She told me she made \$20 over the guidelines and they were going to take her house away and her Medicaid, so she quit her job.

Never should she ever have to do that again. Our bill allows recipients to work part-time, get in the job market, and receive some benefits so they do not have to pick and choose.

What we did in the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities with the WIC, Women Infants and Children's program, many States like South Carolina, we have one of the highest infant mortality rates in the country. We have a lot of low-weight babies born. We have a large population of nutritionally disadvantaged children. But categorical grants limit the way we can use the money.

We have school breakfast programs required by the Federal Government, but we do not have enough participation in many counties to justify the school breakfast. It would be nice to take that pot of money that was going to school breakfast where there was no need and move it over to help children where there is a need.

That is exactly what we have done in this Congress. We have given the people at the local level more discretion to move money from one account to the other to help the target population. They have to report back to us that the target population is being served. It is good common sense. Categorical granting is wasteful. It is bureaucratic approach.

What we have done in our block grant is look at a target population of nutritionally disadvantaged children, collapsed the money into one block grant, require reporting back from the State level, but allowing money to be used where it can best be used in South Carolina, because Georgia may be a different situation; Arizona may be different; it may be different in Ohio. Every State has different needs. We are allowing States to be more flexible, and to me that is the best thing to improve the quality.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let us hear from the gentleman from Ohio. I also wanted to recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] next. He has an interesting tale. We want to talk about another thing in this reconciliation, which is the abolishment of the Department of Commerce.

I wanted to let Mr. HOKE talk about Ohio and welfare quickly.

Mr. HOKE. When I have talked to folks in Ohio about what we are doing with the welfare reform bill, I talk about my own children. And I have a daughter who is 17. She is going to go to college next year. It is a tough I were to say, the way that the current welfare program is that Uncle Sam works, it would be as if I were to say, Sweetheart, you know that I will always there for you. I am always going to support you and you can go out and

I will take care of finding a place for you to stay. You can have a place to stay and I will make sure that you have medical treatment. If you want to have children, you can have children and I will be there for you and I will support that. But I have a couple of conditions. The first condition is that you cannot get married, and the second condition is that you cannot get a job. As long as you do not get a job and do not get married, I will be there for you. I will continue to support you. As many kids as you want to have, that is fine, and I will continue to do that for you.

And if I were to say to my sons, I have two sons, one 13 and one 15, but when they get a little older I were to say to them, Listen, boys, now that you are young men, I am going to take care of you and you can go out and have as many kids as you want. Father as many kids as you want, but I have a couple of conditions for you too. Number one is you cannot get married and I do not want you to take care of these kids. You are not going to be financially responsible. Second of all, I do not want you to get a job. As long as you do not get a job and you are not financially responsible for the kids that you father, I will take care of you.

What do you think you get out of that if that were the way that you were going to treat your children? I can guarantee we would get a lot of illegitimate babies. That is what we have gotten in this country right now. There are a lot of people that seem to think that this is only a problem that exists in the minority community, and they are absolutely wrong.

Mr. KINGSTON. The illegitimacy among whites is going up faster than the blacks' illegitimacy rate.

Mr. HOKE. That is exactly right. Right now overall in the country one out of four Caucasian babies is born out of wedlock and two out of three babies in the minority community are born out of wedlock. Fully one-third of all the babies in this country are born illegitimate.

In my opinion, that is, A, exactly what we have bargained for with respect to the Federal programs that we have created; and B, and I will not say that the Federal programs have done this solely. I think it would be silly and simplistic to suggest that Federal programs are the sole reason for that, but it is a piece of the puzzle. It is part of why this has happened. But the other thing is I honestly believe that going into the 21st century the largest problem that we have to face as a nation and community and society is the problem that comes along with these incredible numbers of illegitimate births.

Mr. KINGSTON. Generally, the children who are born to mothers who are children, not age-appropriate to be mothers, these kids go on to be depend-

ent, to be school dropouts and drug users. That is statistically a fact and something we have to deal with.

I want to recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER]. I wanted to say this about him, and stop me if I am incorrect on this. Mr. CHRYSLER did not go to college and started immediately after high school working for an automobile customizing company. Within a number of years of hard work, he ended up buying the company from his employer, selling it, and reselling it, and going on and owning other businesses and has certainly lived the American dream.

Along the way, had no help from the Department of Commerce, which is there to help businessmen like Mr. CHRYSLER somewhere out there, hypothetically, to become entrepreneurs. He did it somehow without their help. Now his number one goal is to abolish the Department of Commerce. He has succeeded in that. We passed that in the reconciliation bill in the House.

□ 2045

We have got some problems in the Senate, but Mr. CHRYSLER, we are delighted to have you here and delighted to have people like you in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Certainly, it is a story that you only can hear in America. Certainly that is why I am here in Congress, because I want to make sure that my kids and certainly your kids and MARTY's kids all have that same opportunity, because when it is their turn, they at least deserve the opportunity.

MARTY, when he was talking about his daughter, we really have changed this system and it has been a tremendous bill that the House passed. Because we have given the opportunity now to people to get on that bottom rung of that economic ladder, start climbing up out of that dependency on welfare and getting there and not have to lose their child or day care, not losing their health care and not losing their educational opportunities while they are doing that. So it is a dramatic change, and I think it is something that 88 percent of the American people are saying, please change this welfare system from a system that has trapped people on dependency to where we are going today.

It is interesting to note, by the way, that last May we heard a huge hue and cry about the school lunch program. The Republicans were going to eliminate the school lunch program. We are going to take the food out of the children's mouth. But, in fact, guess what happened in August? We started another school year, did we not? Not one story about a school lunch program or a child going without a lunch.

So I guess, digressing a little bit, and going back to the Commerce Department, I did business in 52 countries

around the world, never called the Commerce Department. They never called me. That was fine. And I am proud to say that these freshmen that we have here tonight, J.D. and LINDSEY and certainly MARTY and yourself, JACK, all helped us to put a bill through this House that gave us welfare reform, gave us Medicare reform, gave us tax cuts, gave us a balanced budget in 7 years and gave us medical savings accounts in this country and dismantled a complete cabinet level position for the first time in the history of this country.

The legislation went through 11 committees in this House. I testified in front of those committees. It was unprecedented to be able to bring legislation through there. But it was a very simple and easy story. If the Department of Commerce was in fact the voice of business, as you alluded to, JACK, then they would be right now supporting the balanced budget, the capital gains tax cut, the tort reform, the regulatory reform, because that is what American businesses need. They need to have the Government get off of their backs and let them produce their products, quality products at a good price for the American public. In fact, just the opposite, they are diametrically opposed to all of those things.

The Commerce Department was made up of 100 different programs; 71 of them duplicated someplace else within the Federal Government. And we took it one program at a time. We looked at them and we said, we are going to eliminate the programs that we do not need; we are going to consolidate the duplicative programs. We are going to privatize programs that can be better done by the private sector. And we are going to streamline the operations that we needed to keep.

Mr. KINGSTON. What was the bottom line savings on this dismantling of the cabinet?

Mr. CHRYSLER. About \$6 to \$47 billion, but more importantly, the Commerce Department is set up to give away about \$1 billion a year, corporate welfare it is called, Robert Reich calls it corporate welfare. So if we do not have a Commerce Department for 50 years, we just do not give away \$50 billion. That is the real savings to the American public. They get a better bang, certainly, for their buck.

We need to have a little less government, lower taxes, we need to let people keep more of what they earn and save. And we need to let people make their own decisions about how they spend their money.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HOKE, and I are curious because our freshman class had some reforms. How did your freshman class, how did you decide to dismantle the Department of Commerce, how do 72 Members come together on an idea like this? Because it is certainly revolutionary.

Mr. HAYWORTH. First of all, we have to tip our caps rhetorically, at least, to you gentlemen who preceded us. There were too few of you to have a majority. As our friend from Michigan supplied, we all wore pins for a good deal of time during the transition that called us the majority makers. As the late Walter Brennan used to say on the western show, this is no brag, just fact. I will spare the vocal intonations.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thought that was Jack Webb who said, just the facts.

Mr. HAYWORTH. This is no brag, just facts.

This is a major story in American history. The fact is that a class of 73 coming in to change and help symbolize and really do more than symbolize a historic shift in the balance of power simply rested upon the power of ideas. And it is a tribute to the gentleman from Michigan, who, as you very gratefully and very articulately detailed, worked his way up. Let us also pause here, despite his last name, his benefactor is not the Chrysler Corp. Am I right about that?

Mr. CHRYSLER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HAYWORTH. So those sitting at home saying, oh, sure, he had Lee Iacocca helping him every step of the way, are sorely mistaken. His business was a home grown business. But he took that same type of drive and discipline and working with other Members of the freshman class through a group known as the New Federalists did the heavy lifting. And when people said it could not be done and when it got bogged down in institutional inertia, the fact is that Members of this new majority, including several of you folks who have been here for awhile, stepped forward to say this is too important to leave to the institutional business as usual.

And the important thing to note is that, several Presidents have come to that podium here in this Chamber during joint sessions of Congress, during the respective State of the Union Message, talking about reducing the Cabinet-level agencies. And yet, because there was an unwilling majority on this hill that always believed in the growth of big government, those best laid plans were put aside. They were put on the table. And now, ironically, it is the legislative branch serving as the catalyst to reform and downsize the executive branch and actually all of Government. So my friend from Michigan is to be commended.

Mr. CHRYSLER. It is important, because the freshman class set our actually looking at four different departments: Departments of HUD, Energy, Education, and Commerce. Three of those, I am proud to say, passed and went into the budget resolution act by the Commerce on the Budget: Education, Energy, and Commerce. Unfortunately, we could only get the Senate

to pass the Commerce. And now we are having a problem with the Senate getting that one in reconciliation because of a thing known over in the Senate as the Byrd rule. I think there is a little difference between running for reelection every 2 years rather than 6 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. That bird is an ostrich, I have come to the conclusion.

Mr. GRAHAM. I remember when we first got together as a class, I did a survey, I think it was in Baltimore. Would you be in favor of abolishing the following departments, and the four that you named are about 85-percent agreement on those issues.

Our class as a whole drank the same water, from South Carolina to Maine to California to all over this country. We could have taken our campaign literature and I think made overlays. It was remarkable to me how much consensus there was among 73 people from different parts of the country who viewed the problems in Washington, DC, very similar.

Most of us have limited our own terms. Over half of us have never been in politics. When we add our class with your class, there is about 100 votes in this institution to really change the way you define compassion.

To me compassion is not how much money you can spend or how many agencies you create in Washington. At the end of the day, how many people have you helped? If that is the standard, we have done pretty poor with this model of government.

Mr. KINGSTON. I know Mr. HOKE and I, if you remember when we were sworn in 3 years ago, we had all these great hopes. I think we have pushed some things through. But we really did need to merge our fighting 48.

Mr. HOKE. The reality is that this is a winner takes all institution and that if you are going to change things, you have to have the majority on the opening day.

You get to name the Speaker. The Speaker, names the committee chairs. And to be in the minority in this institution is to be certainly about to do things and to help constituents, but it is to be largely marginalized. The fact is that you could, it would be very difficult to overstate the importance of taking over the majority in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me modify that. I know that the gentleman is saying. The majority is the party in here who agrees with the American people. One party in here does not make the majority. One party plus the American people. And I believe that is what we had when we defeated the socialized medicine plan last year.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). The Chair will remind Members to address themselves

through the Chair by the stated designation and not by the first name.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am amazed that the Speaker is still awake at this hour. I guess I did something wrong. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOKE. I am nonplussed.

I think we were talking about the significance of this change. In fact the numbers that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is talking about, are very important because we are talking about over 110, more like 115. It is a big voting block. It is actually about 50 percent of the majority conference right now, the Republican Conference.

Mr. CHRYSLER. If I could, from the gentleman from Ohio, the number is actually 54 percent of the Republican majority are freshmen and sophomores, so we are of the majority. That really makes a difference, everybody certainly.

Mr. HOKE. I think what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] said is absolutely true. I would not want the Speaker to think that we are not aware of this. That is that the American people spoke very, very clearly with respect to the kind of representation that they want. That is what this is all about.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I would like to talk about what reconciliation means, what the appropriation bills mean because you hear these words a lot.

What we need to do is be honest with people at home? If 80 percent of the public wants a balanced budget, there is one way to go about it. About two-thirds of the Federal budget is in entitlement spending. Welfare programs are entitlement programs. Medicare are entitlement programs, which means that the money gets burped out every year.

There is not a whole lot of debate about what goes on. It automatically gets funded. If you did away with all discretionary spending, you would not be close to balancing the budget. So when you talk about reconciliation, you are talking about controlling the entitlements that are two-thirds of the budget.

So maybe we could talk a minute about why we have gone to Medicare, why we have gone to welfare to make these programs more efficient, serve people better and save money because, if you want the Federal budget balanced, you have got to take a 1965 Medicare program, bring it up to 1995 standards. It has grown 11 percent. The private sector is at 3 and 4. You can actually serve people well without spending the amount of money we are spending up here, and you can balance the budget. If there is anybody out there who is not getting a student loan, call my office because it has got nothing to do with the \$10 billion we saved.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let us quickly go over Medicare. I think that the hour is getting late and the time has about run out. Maybe starting with Mr. CHRYSLER, trustees, April 3, 1995, three of them are Clinton appointees, they say Medicare is going bankrupt in 7 years. What do you do?

Mr. CHRYSLER. In fact, it is going to start spending a billion more than it takes in, started really October 1, that just passed, this year. And so that is why we had to take immediate and decisive and effective action over that item.

Of course by 2002, it is totally bankrupt. You cannot take money from the general fund to fix it. You have to take money out of the trustees fund. That is the reason it was so terribly important. We need to act to preserve and protect and save the Medicare system, and that is exactly the action that was taken. We have done our homework on this much.

It is so important because I know, when I have talked to senior citizens and I have said, here is the system you have now, which is about a 1964 Blue Cross plan that has been codified into law, and this is what you will have under the better Medicare System. I call it the better Medicare System because, if you are not for the better Medicare System, then you must be for the worse Medicare System. But it is the better Medicare System. And when you show that to senior citizens and lay it out in front of them, 85 to 90 percent of them say, absolutely, let me at it. It is great. We only need to move about 14 percent in order to meet the CBO projections.

Mr. KINGSTON. There are some of those options that your parents and mine will be able to get under MedicarePlus.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend from Michigan makes a very valid point here. The point we should make is that those 14 percent will not be compelled by some capricious action or the big hand of government upon their shoulder to be forced into any program. Quite the contrary, what makes this such a unique program is summed up in its name MedicarePlus. It provides choice.

The gentleman from Georgia alluded just moments ago, health maintenance organization. But really undergirding it all is this notion that I think is very important and we cannot mention it enough. If you like traditional Medicare, if you want to keep the System you have now, you can absolutely keep the current System. But if you would like to try a health maintenance organization and indeed with some of the current insurance, medigap insurance in Arizona, some seniors are absolutely enjoying and enthralled with some limited HMO coverage. If they have that opportunity, they get that. Also the notion of a medisave account so that

seniors can have control of their health care dollar.

□ 2100

Just a couple of options, and time would not permit me to go much longer, being a veteran of television.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, then we will go through for a wrap-up, but we are running out of time.

Mr. GRAHAM, why do you not say something on Medisave accounts?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad you mentioned that. My aunt and uncle worked in the textile industry all their life. Social Security is their chief source of income. They have a paper route where they make about \$500 a month in addition to that. Medicare is their chief medical service. If they had the medical savings account option available to them, they would have saved over \$6,000 in the last 3 years because of this. They pay \$46 and a dime out of their check to go to part B premiums. That is what senior citizens pay for part B, the doctor portion of Medicare. They pay \$120-something a month; excuse me, \$220 a month, total for Medicare supplement policy. They have never in the last 3 years spent over \$500 for doctor or hospital bills. They have been lucky, they have been healthy. Under the savings account plan they would not have paid the \$46.10, they would not have to have the supplement policy. The Federal Government would have provided a sum of money around \$5,000. They would have bought a \$10,000 deductible catastrophic illness policy. There would have been some money left over in the account for their routine medical needs. That \$220 a month they would not have to spend. In their case they would save \$6,600 over the last 3 years if they had had that option.

Mr. KINGSTON. Gentlemen, any final words on Medicare or reconciliation?

Mr. HOKE. I guess the only thing that I would say, and I appreciate the question, is just that, as my colleagues know, one of the things that responsible legislators have to do is they have to look at the reality, they have to deal with reality, and then they have to deal with the reality in a way that will preserve a program that we believe in, and we clearly believe in the Medicare Program, and we will preserve it not only for today and this generation, but the next generation as well. That is exactly what we have done. It has been used politically against us because the opposition made the decision early on that this was some sort of an Achilles' heel.

I personally believe that we have been effective at letting the people know that this is a program that was going bankrupt, not according to us, but according to the President's own trustees, that the only responsible

thing was to preserve it, to protect it and save it, and frankly, finally at the end of the day, to improve it for America's seniors. That is what we have stepped up to the plate to do. I do not know if we have done it perfectly, I am not saying we have done it perfectly, but we have done it responsibly, we have done it thoroughly, and in fact we have also taken the political risk of doing it at this time because you know what? If we did not do it, if we did not take that political risk, we would not be doing what the American people expect of us.

Mr. Speaker, I could not be more proud of what we have done with Medicare and, frankly, of the way that we have done that as a model for everything that we have been doing in this Congress in terms of being thoughtful, and responsible and reasonable in going about reshaping the Federal budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. Does the gentleman from Michigan have any closing comments?

Mr. CHRYSLER. Just again, from a real-world perspective, certainly I have in my company, I have medical saving accounts. Seventy-seven percent of my employees got back over a thousand dollars after the first year of operation, and it gives them total control over their health care dollars, and it brings that consumer back into the loop, which is what has been missing in health care in this country as doctors, and hospitals, insurance companies have taken over the health care field and where you and I, the consumer, do not even get a say, and this medical savings account program is one of the major breakthroughs that this Congress has passed, and I am just proud to be here with all of my freshman friends tonight to talk to the American people about that.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Understand that we are profoundly changing the way this Government operates, not to hurt anyone, but to empower the American citizenry to help confront the next century. That is what we are doing through reconciliation. That is what we are doing in our 7-year goal to balance the budget. That is what we are doing by reducing the rate of growth, finding real savings, but not radical cuts. It is not what is radical, it is what is rational and reasonable, and it is what the new majority is doing.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have options as a Congressman to choose from several health care plans. Senior citizens deserve the same thing. My aunt and uncle would have saved over \$6,000 in a 3-year period if they had an option of creating this plan. You can spend less money from Washington, DC and still provide a quality of life better than it exists today if you use good business sense, and that is what has been miss-

ing, and we are going to use good business sense.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER], this concludes our special order. The bottom line is in reconciliation: What is in it for the American people? Welfare reform, saving, and protecting, and preserving Medicare, Medicaid grants, a middle-class tax cut, medical savings account, but, above all, tackling the balanced budget and going after a budget that will even out after 7 years.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CHABOT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWNBACK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KING, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LAZIO of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, on Nov. 1.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MYRICK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes each day, today and on November 2.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today and on November 1.

Mr. LONGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GRAHAM, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, today and November 1.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POSHARD.
Mr. WARD.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. ROEMER.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. COYNE.
Mr. GEJDESEN.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.
Mr. DOYLE.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. LEVIN.
Mr. JACOBS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. COOLEY.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. SOLOMON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARCIA in two instances.
Mr. MCHUGH.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. NEY.
Mr. DOOLEY.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 1, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1574. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in September 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1575. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting

the Administration's report on cost savings for official travel by Federal employees, pursuant to Public Law 103-355, section 6008(c) (108 Stat. 3367); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1576. A letter from the President and CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the seventh annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1577. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1578. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on Transportation user fees, fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 447(e); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1579. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's biennial report entitled "Status of the Nation's Surface Transportation System: Conditions and Performance Report," pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 308(e)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1580. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting notification of fund transfers authorized by sections 9006, 8006, and 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Acts for fiscal year 1993, fiscal year 1994, and fiscal year 1995, respectively, and sections 1001, 1101, and 1001 of the Department of Defense Authorization Acts for those same years; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and National Security.

1581. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the budget request for the Office of Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, for fiscal year 1997, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REGULA: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 1977. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-300). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 251. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions (Rept. 104-301). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 252. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2546) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities

chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-302). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2561. A bill to provide for an exchange of lands located near Gustavus, AK; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. McHALE, and Mr. TALENT):

H.R. 2562. A bill to repeal section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LONGLEY:

H.R. 2563. A bill to authorize certain operations of Canadian oil spill response and recovery vessels in waters of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CANADY (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. McHALE):

H.R. 2564. A bill to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mrs. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to ban activities of political action committees in House of Representatives elections and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mrs. SMITH of Washington (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HORN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 2566. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 28: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 228: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 325: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 789: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 891: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 911: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HOKE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. FRAZER.

H.R. 941: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 958: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 963: Mr. ROSE and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 969: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1619: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 1690: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1733: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1748: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1947: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1955: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 2019: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2024: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. LIGHT-FOOT.

H.R. 2071: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2098: Mr. SALMON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 2166: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2190: Mr. KLINK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CREMEANS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 2240: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 2276: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 2416: Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 2420: Mr. FROST, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2472: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 2476: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2506: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 2535: Mr. JONES, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. BONO.

H.R. 2540: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MICA, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. POMBO.

H.J. Res. 114: Mr. JACOBS.

H. Con. Res. 50: Ms. FURSE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 359: Mr. POSHARD.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

45. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Syracuse Common Council, Syracuse, NY, relative to the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.